

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

NO. 1.—JANUARY, 1899.

I.

THE CHURCH OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY REV. A. E. TRUXAL, D.D.

The person of Christ is a subject in the department of Theology that never becomes exhausted. In like manner the Church, which St. Paul calls the "body of Christ," constitutes a theme that demands new investigation and discussion from time to time. The Christian mind has not yet fully grasped and comprehended all that is involved in the idea of the Church. As theological science progresses through the ages as they come and go, the Church as one of its topics takes its turn in moving to the front for consideration. We propose to treat the subject in the light of the words that stand at the head of this paper.

THE ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH.

The Day of Pentecost is usually regarded as the birthday of the Church. When the Holy Ghost was poured out on the Apostles and disciples and they were illumined spiritually, filled with power and endowed with peculiar gifts, then the Church was instituted. Then Peter stood up and preached the first Gospel sermon, and about three thousand souls were baptized and added to them. That was the beginning of preaching and baptizing. It was the starting point of the Church. Hence it is claimed that the Christian Church was instituted by the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost.

Some writers, however, regard this position as not altogether accurate. The essence of the Church is the divine life and power operative in and through her. This divine life was brought into the world through the manifestation of the Son of God in human flesh. Hence Christ is the foundation of the Church; she starts from Him and rests upon Him; in him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. As Jesus possessed this *πλήρωμα θεοῦ*, so the Church which grew out of His manifestation necessarily partook of the *πλήρωμα Χριστοῦ*, of His fullness of "grace and truth." The Church became and remains a living constitution by virtue of the spirit and life of Christ which were communicated to her and abide in her; hence St. Paul, writing to the Ephesians (2: 20), says, ye "are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ, Himself, being the chief corner-stone." He was also more than the "corner-stone," He was the foundation of the Church in Himself. He in His own person and work was the originator and foundation of the Church.

The origin of the Church has been likened to the origin of man. God made man out of the dust of the ground. But the result of this operation was only the physical or bodily side of his being; God then breathed into his nostrils and he became a living soul. So it is said the gathering of disciples by the Lord, the teaching of them and commissioning of them to do His work when He is gone, and the institution of the sacraments—this work was the formation of the body of the Church, which, however, became a "living soul," a living, acting constitution only after the Holy Ghost had been breathed into it on the Day of Pentecost. According to this idea the work of founding the Christian Church began with the manifestation of Christ in the flesh and was completed with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. This we believe to be the correct apprehension of the subject; with this modification, however, that in the account of man's creation it is assumed that all his bodily organs that he ever afterwards needed were at once finished and completed, whereas, as we shall see later, the bodily organization of the Church was not thus finished previous to the Advent of the Holy Ghost on Pentecost. Besides,

life was present and active before this notable event had been accomplished. The disciples whom Christ made and the Apostles whom He chose were during His sojourn in the flesh already partakers of "His riches and gifts." The "grace and truth" with which He was filled had under different forms and in various measures been communicated to them. This much is clear from the words He addressed to them: "already ye are clean;" "ye are not of the world;" "I am the vine, ye are the branches;" these and numerous other expressions of similar import indicate unmistakably that his disciples, through faith and obedience, were in Him and partakers of His life by which they were freed from the power of sin and made heirs of eternal blessedness. They were already in the Church; they constituted the *κλητοὶ* and the *ἐκλεκτοὶ*, and when assembled for prayer after the ascension of Christ they were already the *ἐκκλησία*. These disciples were not baptized with water when the Holy Ghost was poured out. Some of them, and perhaps all, had been baptized during the life-time of Christ. But the three thousand who that day repented under the preaching of the Gospel were baptized and "added to them," to the body of believers, to the Church. In an important sense the Church was already; nevertheless, the coming of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost constituted an epoch in divine revelation and in the experience of the disciples. They were illumined as never before; spiritual powers were quickened in them; motives were generated; boldness was begotten; purposes and aspirations were inspired in their breasts. They began to preach and teach and work and increase their number. The Church which had been created now started out in her course down through the ages.

HOW IS THE CHURCH CONSTITUTED?

It is somewhat remarkable that the Lord Jesus said so little specifically and definitely about the Church. The most noteworthy passage is Matt. 16: 18, in which He says, "Thou art Peter and upon this rock will I build my Church." This saying has been variously explained. The construction put upon it by the advo-

cates of popery is well known. But Protestants cannot accept their view, for the reasons that the logical conclusions that must flow from such premises, and the practical conclusions as they have been worked out in history, condemn their construction of the passage. Besides, the conceptions which Protestants hold of God and His work do not allow such a meaning to be attached to these words of the Saviour as would support the system of popery.

We have nothing new to suggest on this much-debated passage. We believe that when Christ said "this rock" He meant Peter. The rock is not God, nor Peter's confession, but Peter himself; not Peter, however, as occupying any official position; but Peter as the first disciple to rise by the will of God to such a degree of faith that he could perceive in Jesus the Messiah, the Son of the living God. He was the first real believer and the first one to make a true confession of faith. Besides, he was a man of good, strong character. By his faith and confession Peter was the first beginning of the Church. He was the first stone laid, and hence the rock on which Christ must build His Church. And St. Peter's true successors were not the Bishops of Rome, but the other Apostles and disciples, men and women, who after him one after another became Christians too in the full sense by the exercise of the same faith begotten in their souls by the Father in Heaven. And these Christians, then, united to him by a true, living faith constituted the *ἐκκλησία*—the Church, against which the gates of hell shall never prevail. This body of believers, beginning with Peter, as the original, foundation one, maintaining the true faith and pervaded by the spirit and life of Christ, is the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. The whole body of Christians, including officers and laymen, practicing the Christian ordinances, manifesting the life and power of Christ in the world, constitute that Church which Christ has built on Peter, the foundation rock.

In Matt. 18: 15-18 Christ gives directions for reporting an offending brother to the Church. The term Church here means the same as congregation. It has a local application, yet it has a general meaning. The Church comprehends the body of be-

lievers in the congregation. The Saviour does not speak of ordinances and officers. These necessarily belong to the Church, local and general. But He speaks of the Church as a whole as exercising the functions of admonition and excommunication. So that in these two passages in which the Saviour speaks of the Church He uses the term in its most general and comprehensive sense. He does not refer to ordinances, officers or functions, but to the body of believers as a whole, as performing the functions of the Church, no doubt by means of officers and ordinances, for the Church from the beginning assumed an organized form.

Neither Christ nor any of the Apostles or Evangelists gives us anywhere any description of the form which the Church is to assume in the way of outward organization. No sacred writer has put on record anything like a constitution and by-laws for the government of the Church in all times and climes, in every condition of society, setting forth the various offices with their respective functions, describing the different ordinances to be used and the meanings and purposes to be attached to them, and giving the order and forms of worship to be employed. Some persons imagine that all these things ought to be found in the New Testament. They think that in the Saviour's teachings or in the writings of the Apostles must be found somewhere the correct form of Church organization. And they discover references and statements from which they build up what they regard as the Scriptural pattern for the form of the Church. But the trouble is that denominations that pursue this course almost invariably adopt one or more local and temporary forms as essential features in their organization and as a consequence become very one-sided and imperfect in their organized form. They seek in vain who search the Scriptures for a complete form of Church organization. The thought is based on a misconception of the purpose of the Scriptures and of the true nature of our Holy Christianity. The New Testament is not a book of forms and rubrics, does not contain a system of laws and directions for the government of the Church. And Christianity is in its out-

ward form not like a statue, worked out full and complete in the beginning, that can now be carried about from place to place, and handed down from generation to generation, in an everlasting outward sameness. Christianity does not consist in outward form and organization, but in spirit and life. Spirit and life must necessarily take upon themselves forms, but these are modified and changed according to circumstances and conditions. The life and spirit remain the same, but their modes of operation and forms of manifestation are not always the same. Hence, instead of searching the Scriptures for modes and manners, orders and forms, we ought to seek for principles, truth and life. The latter we can find and apply; the search of the former leads into interminable confusion. Life is not dependent upon form, but form is dependent on the life which it manifests.

THE GOSPEL MINISTRY.

The ministers of the Gospel do not constitute the Church. According to the views of some, the life and power of the Church are lodged with the Gospel ministry. They as the highest officers of the Church dispense her life and grace. The essence of the Church is in and with them; they are the Church. Pursuing this course of reasoning, when a graded order of ministry prevails, the bishops as the highest order of officers, exercising the highest ecclesiastical functions, become the Church. And should one be chosen as the bishop of bishops, as the head of the whole Church, who is the fountal source of all the rights, powers and prerogatives of the Church, then he becomes the Church. The Pope then is the Church, as the King of France claimed to be the State; "I am the State," he said. By that he meant that all the powers of the State were lodged in him as King. He could consequently be subject to no power outside himself. So the Pope, on this theory, could claim to be the Church. And it is a nice theory. The system of the Gospel ministry built up on these conceptions and the right and prerogatives ascribed to them are very fascinating to minds that can accept the underlying principles as true. But, however essential the ministers are in the

organization of the Church, they do not sustain such a relation to the whole body and the life of the body as this position represents. The Gospels make no such representations. The facts presented all point in a different direction.

It is true that Christ chose twelve of His disciples to be His immediate attendants; that these were in more constant and intimate intercourse with Him than any others; that they received more instruction and witnessed more of His works, and that they were especially commissioned to preach and baptize. And yet they were not called to do any work specifically different from that done by others. The seventy were sent out by Christ to perform the same kind of work the twelve were commissioned to do. After the Day of Pentecost the Apostles preached and baptized, but others did so also. Stephen preached and sealed his testimony with his blood; Philip preached and made disciples and under special direction of the Spirit taught and baptized the eunuch; a certain disciple of Damascus baptized St. Paul; the disciples in the dispersion exercised their gifts, preaching, teaching and making believers as they went; James, the brother of the Lord, not one of the twelve, was the leader of the Church in Jerusalem, and gave the decision of the Apostles and elders in regard to a matter that had been discussed pro and con before them; St. Peter himself was challenged by the disciples of Jerusalem to give an account of his doings at Joppa and Cæsarea, and in making his explanation he laid no claim to special rights and prerogatives in virtue of his apostleship; any number of disciples met together would observe the Lord's Supper. All these things stand in opposition to the idea that the rights and powers and life of the Church had been specifically and exclusively deposited with the twelve Apostles to be dispensed by them. The life and Spirit of Christ dwelt in the whole Church, constituted of all believers, and out of the bosom of the Church there arose men and women endowed with certain spiritual gifts, which it was their right and duty to exercise, too, for the welfare of the Church. The individual's gift may have been that of teaching, preaching, prophesying, miracle-working, or some other of the

numerous special gifts that prevailed to a greater or less extent in the early Church, but, whatever the gift was, it was the person's privilege as well as duty to exercise it for the common good. And the only right the Apostles and other acknowledged leaders in the Church possessed in regard to the matter was that of passing on the genuineness of the gift. If the person was a true believer and manifestly under the power of the Spirit he was allowed to proceed and commended in his work. St. Paul was not chosen and commissioned by the twelve, but his faith and testimony and works were acknowledged by them as genuine and he was received as an Apostle. The Apostles had a general work assigned them. They were to begin at Jerusalem and thence proceed to all nations in preaching the Gospel and making disciples. They were traveling missionaries. Others after them doing a similar work were also called Apostles. (I. Cor. 4:9; I. Thess. 2:6.) Beside the Apostles there were many other offices in the early Church, some of a local, others of a general character. But these offices were not created according to some previously adopted code, nor did they grow immediately out of the Apostolate, but they arose out of the life of the Church as this was developed from year to year. As necessity required it deacons, elders, pastors, evangelists and other officers were appointed. Organization and officers with their respective functions are the product of the life of the Church, and not *vice versa*.

THE SACRAMENTS.

Do the sacramental ordinances constitute the Church? It has been claimed that the life and grace of the Lord have been deposited in the sacraments; that these are the fountains through which the "riches and gifts" of divine grace flow unto believers from Christ Jesus, the inexhaustible reservoir. If this be so, then the sacraments and sacramental ordinances become essentially the Church. Believers are then as much dependent upon these as the first disciples were upon Christ. Church and sacraments then become interchangeable terms, the one comprehending as much as the other. This may do very well as a theory,

but we do not find it borne out by the facts of the New Testament. As already said, we find the Church to be constituted of the whole body of believers, with the life of Christ dwelling by the spirit therein, and the sacraments to be organs of the Church. The human body is more than the eye or the ear or any other organ, no matter how valuable and essential to the welfare of the body either or all of these organs may be. So the Church is broader and deeper than all the ordinances, no matter how important and necessary these may be to the health and efficiency of the Church. By this we do not mean to imply that the Church exists or could exist without offices and ordinances. Just as little as we can conceive of a human body without members and organs, so little can we conceive of the Church as a living constitution without sacraments and ministers. The question pertains as to the mutual relation which they sustain to each other. And our contention is that the sacraments grow out of the Church rather than the Church out of the sacraments.

Ceremonies and sacraments belonged to the Church from her very first beginnings. But just as little as the Saviour said specifically about the Church, so little also did He speak of the ordinances of the Church. Baptism and the Lord's Supper come from Him. And yet it is remarkable how little He emphasized these as essential ordinances of the Church. In John 3:5 He teaches Nicodemus the necessity of a birth of water and the spirit. We believe that constructively and theologically these words refer to Baptism. But many good Christians and men learned in the Scriptures can find in them no reference to Baptism at all other than what is called a spiritual Baptism. This is an evidence that if the Saviour had Baptism in mind at the time He spoke of it so indefinitely that His meaning is discerned with great difficulty. The only other passage in the Gospels in which He is reported to have referred to Baptism is that giving the Apostolic commission in which occurs the phrase "baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." Accepting these words as genuine, they seem to assume that the practice of Baptism existed already. They do not have

the form of a direct command instituting something *de novo*. But it is a serious question whether Jesus expressed these words in the form in which they are given. The fact that not a single instance is recorded in which any Apostle or Evangelist or other person made use of this formula in baptizing argues very strongly against the genuineness of the words. We do not mean to question the fact of the institution of Baptism or the adoption of it by the Saviour as a perpetual ordinance for the Church. We heartily adopt the words of Professor Beyschlag with reference to the matter when he says: "However, apart from this subsidiary point, no real doubt can exist as to the institution of Baptism by Jesus for those who find in the intercourse of the Risen One with His disciples something more than self-deception. The practice of Baptism as a rite of reception, a practice, so far as we can see, was from the beginning of the Church quite a matter of course—just as much a matter of course to Paul as to the earlier Apostles—cannot well be explained without an appointment of Jesus underlying it."* Besides, it must not be forgotten that Christ in His day through His disciples practiced Baptism too (see John 3 : 22 and 4 : 1, 2), and that many were baptized under His ministration (John 3 : 26 and 4 : 1). There is no evidence that the Apostles were baptized, though such may have been the case, but from the above statements it is evident that many, if not indeed all, of the converts made by Christ and His disciples under Him were admitted to the company of believers by Baptism. Unfortunately, with the exception of the above citations the Scriptures are silent with regard to the matter. But as the Jews had various washings as signs of purification, as John baptized unto repentance, and as Jesus by the hands of His disciples baptized too during His ministry, it is altogether natural that He should directly or indirectly command His disciples to use Baptism as a perpetual ordinance in the prosecution of the work which they were to do after their endowment with power by the Holy Ghost.

When we come to study the teaching of Christ with regard to

* New Testament Theology, by Dr. Willibald Beyschlag, Vol. 1, p. 178.

the Lord's Supper we find again that He said very little with reference to it. The dissertation given in the sixth chapter of St. John has been associated with the Lord's Supper. Constructively, theologically and liturgically the words of this chapter may be properly thus applied. But that the Saviour meant at the time to teach His disciples the meaning and importance of the Lord's Supper as an ordinance in the Church is more than doubtful. The only other reference to it is its institution on the night of His betrayal. In connection with the last passover supper Christ ate with His disciples, He took the bread and when He had given thanks He broke and gave it to them; and in like manner He also took the cup and gave it to them, and He referred the whole transaction to His approaching death by calling the bread His body broken and the cup His blood shed for them, and according to St. Luke 22:19 He gave them a command to observe this ceremony, saying, "This do in remembrance of me." Many Biblical scholars, however, regard this last sentence as a later addition. Matthew and Mark (Matt. 26:26-30; Mark 14:22-26) describe the last supper in almost the exact words of each other, but neither of them refer to any words the Saviour uttered indicating the great importance of observing it in the Church of the future. St. John, in like manner, is silent in regard to the matter. But the Apostle Paul in 1 Cor. 11:23-29 gives a clear and full account of the institution of the Lord's Supper as he had received it from the Lord. The institution of the Lord's Supper by the Lord as a perpetual ordinance in His Church and the spiritual importance and necessity of it are not questioned at all, but attention is called to the fact that according to the Gospel records Jesus did not lay such special stress on the observance of this and other ordinances as we would expect Him to have done in case His purpose had been to give His disciples a precise form of the outward organization of the Church. He laid His hands on the little children when He blessed them (Matt. 19:15), and on sick persons when He healed them (Mark 8:23), but there is no evidence that He meant thereby to institute a ceremony to be observed. The

Apostles and others after Him used this rite in setting persons apart to some special office (Acts 6:6), and in communicating the Holy Ghost to believers (Acts 8:18 and 9:16). But the thought to which we desire to call attention in this connection is that the Lord Jesus spoke very little to the disciples of the significance and importance of ordinances and rites. According to St. Mark He did, indeed, say, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." But in the second member of the declaration the condemnation is made to turn on the absence of faith. And that is in harmony with the whole tenor of his teaching from beginning to end. That which He emphasized and on all occasions pressed upon the minds and hearts of His disciples was the necessity of faith, righteousness, love, goodness, mercy, service and obedience to the will of the Father in Heaven.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHURCH.

The Church being a living constitution necessarily is characterized by growth and development. She grew in the beginning and she grows now. The growth we refer to does not pertain to her increase in membership, but to the form of organization she assumed from time to time. Let us take in the first place the matter of officers. The official representation of the Church consisted in the beginning of eleven Apostles. The place of Judas was filled by the selection of Matthias, which increased the number again to twelve. A peculiar condition of the Church furnished an occasion for calling and appointing seven deacons. The duties to be performed by these officers were determined by the circumstance of the times. Later St. Paul was called to the Apostleship, as he said, by the Lord Himself. Afterwards others labored in the Church and were called Apostles. (2 Cor. 8:23; Phil. 2:25.) In Acts 11:30 we read of elders and afterwards quite frequently of the Apostles and elders. No account of the establishment of this office is given us. It seems to have grown into existence out of the life and necessities of the Church. The appointment and ordination of elders are referred to in Acts 14:23 and in Titus 1:5. But as nothing is said of the institution

of this office we conclude that it arose out of the requirements of the Church and was suggested by the order existing in the Jewish synagogue. In Cor. 12: 28 and Eph. 4: 11 St. Paul, in enumerating officers, mentions apostles, prophets, teachers, pastors, workers of miracles, healers, helpers, counsellors, speakers in tongues and interpreters of tongues. The same person may, of course, have possessed a number of these gifts and performed several functions. But it is very clear that these various offices and functions grew out of the Church as her life was developed from year to year in different parts of the country. And further, not only were officers created as conditions and circumstances required them, but they also again disappeared when no longer needed. Having subserved their purpose they passed away. An organ no longer required and used becomes atrophied. Quite a number of the offices mentioned in the New Testament ceased to exist in the following centuries. The number and character of the officers were gradually changed. Each age, by the peculiar condition of the Church and the world, seems to call into existence and exercise new organs and functions in the ecclesiastical body. Sunday-school teachers and leaders of Young Peoples' Societies of the present day are examples of the fact that the Church from her inner life produces offices as occasions demand. Consequently it is folly to suppose that the Church, or any branch of it, has in the present day the same officers performing the same functions that existed in Apostolic times.*

In like manner progress and growth can be discerned in the practice of the ordinances of the Church. The Jews made use of various kinds of washings as signs of purification; John baptized unto repentance for the remission of sins; Christ also baptized by the hands of His disciples, and on the Day of Pentecost the Apostles and disciples began baptizing and continued it ever

* "The most that can be said is that the Apostolic age contains fruitful germs for various ecclesiastical organizations subsequently developed, but none of them can claim divine authority except for the Gospel ministry which is common to all. Dean Stanley asserts that no existing Church can find any pattern or platform of its government in the first century."—*History of the Christian Church*, by Philip Schaff, Vol. 1, p. 487.

afterwards. Thus Christian baptism came up out of Jewish practices, and the significance of the ordinance increased step by step until its full meaning was reached in the Christian Church. In the first place adults only were baptized; afterwards the rite was administered to the children of believing parents. What forms and modes were originally employed cannot be definitely determined; but in subsequent ages, and at present, various modes and manners were and are called into practice.

In regard to the Lord's Supper a similar progress is to be observed. The disciples in a simple manner observed it at first in connection with their ordinary meals in their houses. Later it was associated with the *ἀγάπη*, a social feast, and finally this ordinance became the central part of congregational worship. The observance of this Christian feast has a history. So far as its use and outward form of observance are concerned, they were developed from stage to stage according to circumstances until they reached the practices of subsequent ages. The Lord's Supper as an ordinance of the Church was not instituted with a completed and fixed outward form. This grew as the external form by which any kind of life manifests itself grows.

Other rites and forms were also from time to time practiced by the Apostolic Church as conditions and occasions seemed to require. Some of these again passed away; others were modified and changed to suit the changed manifestations of the spirit and life of the Church. The essence of the Church is always deeper and broader than officers and ordinances; consequently these are dependent upon the Church. They give expression to the conditions and requirements of the Church. The Church represents the life, light and power which were brought into the world by the Lord Jesus Christ; as these unfold themselves in their operations among the children of men, the Church, which is the form by which they manifest themselves, must assume a corresponding organization and perform such functions as are demanded. Hence we say the Church has grown and grows, very much like any other kind of life grows in the world.

THE CHURCH DIVINE.

But if the foregoing positions be correct, is the Church not simply a natural and human institution? We think not. We hold the Church to be a divine organism; not, however, because the members and body of this organism were created fully and completely by the Lord in the beginning. For such was not the case. The members of the oak exist only in possibility in the acorn. The organs of the human being are undeveloped in the newborn babe. The Church did not come from the hand of the Lord fully developed and finished, like Minerva from the head of Jupiter. There is no "thus saith the Lord" for everything the Church possesses and does, and no example in word or deed of the Master for every office in the Church, with its peculiar function, and for every mode and manner of its operation. The Lord could not have given commandments and directions for everything the Church was to be and do in all subsequent ages, and for the manner in which every particular of her work was to be accomplished. No disciple, however strong of mind and highly illumined by the spirit, could have apprehended and comprehended the meaning of such elaborate directions. In the very nature of the case, many things had necessarily to grow out of the life of the Church as she was developed in the world from generation to generation.

But we claim the Church to be a divine organism for the following reasons:

1. Because she was founded by the Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God.

2. Because she is partaker of His spirit, life and power—of the *πλήρωμα Χριστοῦ*. During His ministry in the flesh His disciples received of His spirit and life; after His Resurrection He breathed on them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost;" and on the Day of Pentecost they received a full influx of divine life and power through the outpouring of the Spirit. The indwelling spirit and life of the Church by which there was inspired in the souls of believers faith, hope and love, manifested in godly living, came from above, from the Father of Lights, through the Revelation of the Son of God, by the operation of the Holy Ghost. The

Church, as St. Paul says, is the body of Christ. The soul of the Church is the life of Christ. Hence she is a divine organism.

3. The Church is divine because Christ is her ever-living Head. He is the Head of the Church which is His body, not simply because she originated with Him—because He is the Founder, the Fountain and Source whence she has taken her rise; but more particularly because the Lord glorified in heaven continues to be and will forever remain the Head of His body in the world. He is livingly connected with the Church and nourishes and sustains her life. If this were not the case, His promises, "Lo I am with you always even unto the end of the world," and "I will send you another Comforter that He may abide with you forever," would fall to the ground. The Church has not a dead Head, nor an absent one; but one that is ever living and ever present. And that Head is divine. From Him proceed continually life, light, inspiration and power for the officers, ordinances and members of the Church. He moves upon the minds, hearts and will of His people, or will if they suffer Him to do so by humbly seeking His blessing and grace. But to find Him and to hear His voice the Church must not go back eighteen hundred years to Jesus of Nazareth, but look to the Lord of Glory whose throne is in the Heavens, who, nevertheless, rules and works in His Kingdom on earth. The Lord is in the Church and accomplishes His purposes by the Church, not arbitrarily or by simple might, but by teaching the minds and hearts of believers by His spirit through their experience, good and bad. In this way the Lord is in the Church now for the purpose of teaching, enlightening, guiding, inspiring, strengthening and comforting His people. And blessed are they that have ears to hear. Through the events of the past year the Lord is undoubtedly speaking to the Spanish Church and to the Pope of Rome and to the whole Church.

The Church is a divine constitution because she is the form by which the Kingdom of God on earth comes to an outward expression. Through the Church the power of the Lord reaches men, lays hold of them, elevates and purifies them and enables them to accomplish the mission and reach the goal of their existence.

II.

THE SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN THE CHURCH.

BY REV. S. R. BRIDENBAUGH, D.D.

Organization has been pronounced the secret of our age. It is a marked characteristic of the Church of to-day. The idea of organization is not new. In was in the Church from the beginning. Where two or three believers are gathered together there is a call for fellowship, for association and for coöperation.

In order to the accomplishment of the great purpose for which it has come into existence, organization within the Church is a necessity. It is sometimes said that Christ formed no organization, and that He gave no rules for the construction of one. That is true. After the resurrection He met the Apostles, whom He had selected from His followers early in His ministry, and who had remained loyal to Him, and He directed them to continue their ministry. They were to teach and make disciples. What they had received from Him they were to communicate to others. But during the days of His earthly ministry He organized no society, formulated no constitution, prescribed no rules. Christ did not establish a Church all officered and marshalled. What did He? He gave life. "I have come," said He, "that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." "I give unto them eternal life." "Father, thou hast given thy Son power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given Him." He gave life, and the very nature of this life is to express itself in form. This life had power to create its own organization, and it has done so.

St. Paul has defined the Church as *the body of Jesus Christ*. Such designation occurs frequently in his epistles. See Eph. 1:23, 4:12; Rom. 12:5; 1 Cor. 12:12; Col. 1:18. By this figurative language we are to understand the Apostle as

teaching that the Church is an organism—composed of living members, powers and functions. Christ is not only the ruling Head of the Church; He is also its invisible, all-pervading soul. The Church lives as Christ lives and works in her. She is ever dependent on Him for her continued existence as really as the body is dependent on the soul, or the branches on the vine.

Development and expansion are included in the very idea of organic life. And hence the Apostle, who calls the Church the body of Christ, speaks of the growth and edification of that body.

It is possible to have organization without life, but life cannot continue long without organization. In nature we know of life only as it manifests itself under organized forms. And as life in an individual—physical, muscular, nervous, sentient—must be organized, even thus, according to the Apostle, must the life of divine truth in the world be an organized life, with head and hands and feet.

Though Christ set up no ecclesiastical organization, He did unfold the principles of a kingdom which He came to establish. These are illustrated in His own wonderful life, and unfolded in the parables He uttered. His "Kingdom is not of this world," yet it is in the world and works upon the world. It assumes in the very nature of things an outward form. This appears in the visible local organizations, which in the New Testament are designated by the word "ekklesia," and fittingly translated Church.

The Church has been defined as the "visible earthly form of the Kingdom of Christ." It is the divine organization intended for its advancement and triumph. Organized and governed by the principles exhibited in the life of the now invisible King and since revealed to His faithful followers by the Holy Spirit, the Church represents that Kingdom. Thus divinely constituted and inspired "the Church is God's organization, in which the Holy Spirit dwells, and from which divine spiritual forces go forth to transform the world from sin to holiness, and subject it to the sway of Christ."

The Church and the Kingdom, it is true, are not identical. Neither are they coextensive. The Kingdom is as much grander than the Church as an ideal is grander than the actual. It is important to keep in mind the distinction between these two—the Church and the Kingdom. We pray: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven." With Dr. Josiah Strong, we believe that the last clause interprets the first; the Kingdom will be fully come when God's will is perfectly done in earth; that is when all of His laws are perfectly obeyed. That means heaven on earth, the consummation of the

" * * * * One far-off, divine event,
To which the whole creation moves."

To aim at the realization of the lofty ideal of her Lord is the duty of the Church. Christ is the Head of the Church, which is His body, and "for what does the body exist except to do the will of the Head?" We are not to think of the Church as an end in itself, but a means to the Kingdom as an end.

In character the Kingdom is both subjective and objective. It is an organic Spiritual Society. Its members are one in Jesus Christ, the Head of the Kingdom, and are united to one another in virtue to their loyalty to Christ and their union with Him. But in the teaching of Christ there is another important aspect concerning the Kingdom. It conforms to the law of growth. This idea is prominent in many of the parables. The Kingdom is like leaven, like a mustard seed which becomes a great plant, like a seed sown in the ground. "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." Whether these parables be viewed as representing the development of the Kingdom in the individual soul or its expansion in human society, they picture the progress of the Kingdom as an organic process, ever enlarging, and, by the "operation of divine forces, moving toward the appointed goal."

To hasten the coming of this Kingdom is the mission of the Church. For the attainment of this end organizations within the Church are most helpful—yea, are an actual necessity. To this position objections are sometimes heard from faithful, able

men, who assert that the Church itself, being a divinely authorized society, is perfectly adapted to the prosecution of every department of Christian enterprise, and that, therefore, no other societies are needed. They seem to think that the organizing of Societies to do the Church's work is a reflection upon the wisdom of the Church's Lord; that He has made no provision for such organizations; that the Church as divinely constituted is adapted to all times and to the accomplishment of the ends which its Head and Founder had in view; that no changed conditions of human society render necessary any other agencies and organizations.

But these objections we believe to be based on an erroneous conception of the Church, a view of the Church as a crystallization, or an institution in which all offices and functions are clearly defined and fixed, so that, however much it may increase in size, it can never change its form. The Church, however, is not a dead crystal, not a divine institution, complete from the beginning and forever incapable of change in outward organization. Rather, as we have seen, is the Church a living organism, so that, though it can never change in its essential nature, it may expand and take on new growths in harmony with its own nature and purposes. As a self-evolving organism the Church must possess within itself the power of change and adaptation to the ever-varying conditions of its environment, and of giving birth to new societies as they may become necessary for the accomplishment of its work in different periods of history. In all its parts the Church is subject to the law of growth and progress. The universal law of historical development is here most clearly manifest.

We fail to find in the New Testament any such ironclad notion of the Church as will exclude the organization of societies within local congregations.

In the 4th chapter of Ephesians, as well as in the 12th of first Corinthians, St. Paul certainly makes ample provision for a division of labor, showing how God gives diversities of gifts unto men, suited for various offices, not only apostles, prophets and miracle-workers, but also evangelists, teachers, helps, govern-

ments, etc. It may not be possible to define exactly what those helps were in Apostolic times, but, if a Sunday-school, a Ladies' Aid Society, a Mission Band, a Missionary Society, a Young Men's Brotherhood or an Endeavor Society can help the pastor advance the Lord's work we assuredly believe it to be in accord with the spirit of New Testament teaching to have such society established. St. Paul, when feeling the need of additional helpers, hesitated not to establish a new office, appointing deacons to look after the interests of the poor in early Christian congregations. And he, as well as other Apostles, employed the aid of women in planting and fostering the societies that were to bear the name of Jesus and propagate His principles. He writes of "those women who labored with me in the gospel," commends Phœbe, a deaconess, and in one letter mentions at least ten distinguished women, whom he specially valued, because they helped him in his great work. There is certainly sufficient Apostolic warrant for such organizations within the Church as Women's Aid Societies, Guilds and Missionary Societies.

For the general work of the Church, such as the founding and managing of colleges, theological seminaries, orphan homes and missions in the home and foreign field, it is recognized the Church must organize boards and societies. They are parts of the Church, growing out of her very life and spirit. To organize the forces of a local congregation involves the same principle. And it is the glory of the Church that it is sufficiently flexible to effect such organizations without in any sense marring its real unity or losing its divinely constituted form.

It is by means of organization that the different elements and workers of the Church can be brought into systematic order, and be prepared for harmonious operation and coöperation. Without proper organization there will be in any congregation a certain amount of unused material. In an assembly of Christian people there are diversities of gifts, and hence there ought to be a diversity of work and sphere. In nature there is a faithfully kept law of correspondence and correlation. The fin of the fish suggests the water; the ear tells of sound, and the eye of light.

So every variety of gift and adaptation among the members of a congregation argues a corresponding fitness of employment.

The work of the Church is varied—evangelistic, educational, sociological. Souls are to be won, and then educated and trained to save others. In the Lord's vineyard there should be no idle souls. The great matter is to reduce work for Christ to such a system as that for all and each there is a place, or, as some one has said, a hole fitted for every peg, whatever its size and shape.

Among the causes of the comparatively few working Churches, and the small number of active members in the average local congregation, is the failure properly to organize its membership and give each a work to do. Few Christians will set themselves to work. They may desire to be useful, and may have peculiar adaptations for work of one kind or another, but they know not how to begin or to proceed. Work must be assigned them. The completely organized local Church with its meetings for prayer and praise, its Sunday-school, its Bible Classes, its Guilds, Aid Societies, Brotherhoods, Mission Bands, Missionary Societies and social gatherings of various kinds is designed to afford opportunity to every one who wishes both to grow and to work. Like Briareus it has a hundred hands and like Argus a hundred eyes. It is not possible that all engage directly in the same sphere of religious activity, but all can indirectly promote and support the whole work.

Nehemiah tells us that the explanation of his success in finishing the wall of Jerusalem was found in the fact that the "people had a mind to work." Having a people with a mind to work, it becomes the duty of Church authorities to provide for them proper methods, instruments and appliances; that is, associations ought to be formed, each with a definite aim, wherein all members may employ their talents for the advancement of the cause of Christ.

All such organizations should be under the direct control of the pastor and his Consistory, Session or Vestry. No society should be permitted to work independent of, or in opposition to, the governing body of the congregation. And, between the different organizations there should be no jealousy, but all should

heartily coöperate, so that the work in all departments shall tend to one common end. Unless there be, in addition to methods and appliances, a thorough consecration to Christ and to His cause, members will soon grow weary in well doing, and the progress of the Kingdom will be retarded.

In organizing societies within a congregation there should be taken into account the constituency and environment of that particular Church. Not all congregations need the same societies. Some need more and others a less number of organizations. No rule can be laid down of universal application.

Certain elements there are which nearly every congregation has to deal with, in some degree, at least; the unchurched; neglected children; young people; new families moving into the neighborhood; persons in need of material assistance; those in special need of religious instruction, guidance and inspiration. Then, too, every local Church ought to sustain relations to the grand missionary movements of the age. It can be said, therefore, that upon every Church are imposed certain conditions which can be most wisely met by a proper division of labor, such as is rendered possible by one or more organizations. A few societies, properly officered with thoroughly consecrated men and women, will help to find the particular sphere of work for which each member is adapted.

We all know of congregations that do but little for the Kingdom of Christ, either in their own locality or away from home in our own or other lands. They may have good elements, pious men and women. In such congregations would not some enterprising organizations under the combined control of the pastor and his consistory result in great blessing to the membership and in good to the Church at large? Congregations in the country, in villages or small towns will need but few societies. And so with the smaller congregations in cities. In the larger towns and cities, however, there are congregations of greater numerical strength where the demands are heavier and more varied. To meet such requirements an increased number of organizations may be needed. The work confronting these congregations requires

them to utilize in large measure the latent energies of their members. It is not possible properly to shepherd a large congregation in town or city, attend to the wants of the membership, and look after the evangelization of the unchurched masses except by some greater, wider and more complex system of organization than is usually prevalent in the small congregations of our towns or even in the large parishes of rural districts. The number and character of the societies should be measured by the needs of the time and place. A vine has a right to grow, and in so doing add new branches; so has the Church a right to grow, and in growing become more complex, carrying blessings through multiplied channels to the human race. This is true because the Church is not a machine nor an institution with form fixed and complete for all time, but a living organism, capable of adjusting itself to the changing conditions of its environment, and of producing such new organizations as may be necessary to do the Lord's work in a given locality and in a particular period of history.

An important example of the need and value of organization is given in the 18th chapter of Exodus, which contains the record of Moses attempting by his own personal effort to do justice to every claim brought before him. The result was that, although the people stood by Moses from the morning until the evening, he was unable to accomplish all that was required. Jethro gave to Moses wise counsel. He showed the inadequacy of his plan of attempting himself to do the whole work, while permitting the talent of others to lie idle, saying to him, "The thing that thou doest is not good. Thou wilt surely wear away, etc.," and then advised him to provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness; and place such over them, to be *rulers of hundreds, and rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens, and let them judge the people, etc.*" Thus the needs of the people in that age were met by organizations whereby talent was evoked and developed to the relief of the overworked leader and to the great good of the people. It is better for a pastor to "set ten men to work than to do ten men's work." The lay element should be reached, moved, and induced

to aid in the work of the Church. A vast power is here lying idle in many congregations which needs to be more thoroughly aroused, consecrated and organized. If existing methods in any Church fail to bring into activity the forces at hand, why not adopt such measures and establish such societies as the place and time seem to demand?

But there should be a limit to the number of organizations within any Church. It requires but little reflection to be convinced that the present tendency of many Churches is to over-organization, and to a consequent dissipation of spiritual energies. There are congregations in which have come to exist several practically independent organizations, working often at cross-purposes. Ambitious persons, who are not made officers according to their wish in some existing society, have a weakness for starting something else, in which they can personally figure. They will have more societies, and will strive by mechanical means and novel methods to awaken enthusiasm, such enthusiasm, alas, as manifests itself too often in an epidemic of conventions where the chief characteristics are the swinging of hats and waving of handkerchiefs.

Harmful results must follow such divisiveness in any Church. From such over-organization disorganization is an inevitable result. Under these circumstances there can be no united zeal—no such thing possible as concentration of attention and energy on the great spiritual ends and enterprises for which the Church exists.

The cure for such condition of affairs in a congregation ought to suggest itself at once upon the recognition of the malady. When the pastor is convinced of weakness or danger arising from an undue multiplicity of organizations he should cut off those which seem but useless appendages, or assimilate them with other societies which are striving to realize the true end of the Church. Many a pastor finds, perhaps by sad experience, that some organizations within his Church are like a fifth wheel to a wagon, simply impedimenta—useless baggage. They are barnacles on the ship—hindrances; showy they may be, but burdensome. We know of a Church in which there is a company of the Boys'

Brigade. Last year it cost the congregation with which it is connected, for guns, uniform and other equipment, the sum of two hundred dollars. It is safe to assume that during that time it did not contribute to the treasury of the congregation for local or benevolent purposes a tithe of the above amount. For the records show that this very congregation, having a flourishing Boys' Brigade and numerous other societies, failed to pay its classical apportionment for Home and Foreign Missions. Such organizations within the Church should cease to exist. A society that is a parasite should not be tolerated in any congregation. Those only should be continued that contribute to the real strength and prosperity of the Church; that secure as results thoroughness, harmony, enthusiasm, and greater efficiency. To get rid of others will be found a matter of supreme delicacy, but it must be done kindly, yet firmly. Persons who are headed off from the ambitious project of fastening upon a congregation some unnecessary organization are apt to forget the covenant they made with Christ and the Church, and to glide away into opposition to the pastor and his spiritual council. Let them be credited with any good they have done, and if kind words and gentle dealing will not win them back they must be permitted to depart.

There is truth in the statement occasionally made that organizations run the risk of destroying individualism, although properly used they may develop it. Machinery may be made to supersede personal work, and when individual activity ceases there will follow a diminished sense of responsibility and gradually a lack of affectionate zeal. Yet the real intent of organization is to kindle enthusiasm, deepen the sense of responsibility, find out work and set the Christian directly at it. All human power is first of all individual, personal; and an organization is strong in exact proportion as are the individuals which constitute it. The strength of the fountain depends wholly on its separate, tributary streams. It needs be borne in mind that the working power of the Church, its authority and its ideal, are primarily spiritual. Organizations within the Church cannot augment its real life. They can be effective only so far as they are imbued with the spiritual life that emanates from Christ, the great Head of the Church.

The present tendency to organization within the Church is in line with the drift of the age to specialization. In study, the natural and applied sciences, and in all labor can be noted the constant tendency to differentiation.

And it is felt by many, moreover, that we must form religious organizations to help counteract the secular. Lodges and clubs abound in every community. Estimate the number of such societies in any town or city that absorb the time, money and energy of the people. They are not wholly evil. Behold their work in behalf of their widows and orphans, their injured and poor. Did Church diaconate system ever surpass theirs in thoroughness and efficiency? It cannot be out of place to ask the question: Would there be the same great popular demand for these secular agencies if the Church had her forces thoroughly organized and were fulfilling her mission of charity to the needy? At all events one must regret that the hordes of men now in these secret societies of benevolent intent cannot or will not find in the Church all the good they get from them, and vastly more.

We are living in times that make great demands upon the Christian Church. The law of progress fostered by Christianity itself makes prominent to-day certain moral and social reforms. Man's relation to his fellow-man is one great subject of the age. Sociological questions must receive the attention of the Church. They have to do with the very purpose of her existence. Such times call for progressive methods on the part of denominations and congregations. For the best religious work organization is needful. But we should analyze carefully, and permit only such agencies as grow naturally from the life and spirit of the Church, as "give evidence that they have the divine approval and are vital with heavenly grace and power."

Keeping close to the life of Christ, which is incarnated in His Church, we should organize our forces in accordance with His divine teaching and providential unfolding. We cannot go wrong, if we "draw our inspiration from the living Christ, and so plan and strive and work as to follow in His steps, keep within the sound of His voice, and apply the revealed principles of our faith."

III.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY TRINITY AS RELATED TO THE RELIGIOUS LIFE OF THE CHRISTIAN.

BY REV. WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER, PH.D.

As will be seen at a glance, the subject is of a practical character. We are to discuss, not the doctrine of the Holy Trinity as such, but the relation of that doctrine to the religious life of the Christian. We are, therefore, not concerned with the evidences and arguments on which this doctrine rests, nor with the considerations which make it intelligible to the understanding; but taking that for granted, we are to inquire into its ethical value. Does an intelligent apprehension of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in any way influence the practical, daily life of the Christian? If so, how?

The general question may, I think, be conveniently discussed under two heads, the one general, the other particular.

I. How does our conception of the being and character of God influence our religious and moral life?

II. What is the particular influence of the Trinitarian conception of Deity upon the life of mankind?

Both questions, it will be readily seen, belong to the sphere of ethics; and both of them are finally of the intensest practical importance.

I. How does our conception of the being and character of God influence our religious and moral life?

It is to be feared that in the popular notions of the religious life there is very little connection between men's conception of the character of God and morals. If a man believes that there is a God who reigns over heaven and earth; if he be honest and upright, trying to do what he knows to be right; if he accept Jesus Christ as his Saviour, that is often supposed to be all that

is necessary. Whether he accept the doctrine of God in the theistic or in the deistic sense, whether he accept the Unitarian or the Trinitarian conception is supposed in the end to make very little difference. There can, however, be no greater mistake; for there is no conception which in the end is so far-reaching, and which so profoundly affects the entire conduct of life, as the conception of the character and being of God which we carry about with us in our bosoms.

On this point Dr. Geo. B. Stephens remarks: "Nothing is more important in religious thought and life than a true conception of the character of God. No idea is so powerful and wide-reaching in its effects as the idea which we cherish concerning Him. The difference between the gross rites and absurd superstitions of heathenism and the highest forms religious worship and service is, at bottom, a difference in the idea of God. There is nothing upon which our whole conception of the world and of life so much depends as upon the idea of the character of God which we cherish. Little as we think it, every day is bitter or hopeful, every duty commonplace or inspiring, every sacrifice irksome or joyous—in short, every day's work and experience full of low and selfish meanings, or of noble and divine meanings, according to the practical thought of God and of our relations to Him which we carry about with us day by day. It will not seem true at first thought that our daily life has so deep a root; but the more we reflect upon it, the more evident, I believe, it will appear." *

Dr. Stearns, in *Present-Day Theology*, affirms: "The question of God's moral character is one which we cannot for a day leave unanswered. The sweetest sleep is embittered if we know not what is the nature of the God who rules us. Death is a terror if we are ignorant of the God into whose presence we are to be ushered." †

St. Paul in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, after showing how "that which may be known of God is manifest in

* *Doctrine and Life*, p. 71.

† Quoted by Stephens, in *Doctrine and Life*, p. 73.

them," that is, the heathen, and after affirming that "the invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even His everlasting power and divinity," goes on to show what the result was of their changing "the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man, and of birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." He affirms that, "as they refused to have God in their knowledge, God gave them up to a reprobate mind, to do the things which are not fitting; being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, hateful to God, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, unmerciful" (Rom. 1: 28-31). In a word, all the abominations of heathen morals and religion are ultimately traceable to the fact that men refused to have God in their knowledge. Because they loved darkness rather than the light, they shut out the light of the everlasting Word, which had been shining in the hearts of every one of them; and the consequence was that they were given over to "a reprobate mind," by which they did those things which were not fitting.

This is stating the subject negatively, by showing the influence which a misconception of the character of God has on the religious and moral life of man. The same truth is presented from a positive standpoint by our Saviour in His great-high priestly prayer, where He says, "And this is life eternal, that they should know thee, the only true God, and Him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ" (St. John 17: 3). Of course, eternal life is to be taken in the concrete sense as including all that is implied in the life of blessedness in the perfected kingdom on high, its perfect purity and holiness, its absolute freedom from everything that defiles or worketh sin, its moral perfection as well as its supreme blessedness. As including all that, eternal life, according to the Saviour's own definition, is nothing more nor less than to know the only true God, as He is in His own character, and as

He has manifested Himself in His supreme revelation in Jesus Christ.

Of course, by knowing God here something more is meant than ordinary, abstract, intellectual conception. The Saviour dealt very little in abstractions; His thought, as well as His teaching, is nearly always in the concrete; and by knowing God He meant such an apprehension of His character and being as would bring us into conscious communion with Him in the whole of our life. And that is, after all, the only way in which the true God can be known. He whose knowledge of God depends simply on definitions, whose conceptions of His character are simply deductions from words and phrases picked up here and there, even from the Bible, does not know God. The only way God ever can be really known is by our working our way through words and phrases back to the original experience out of which the words and phrases grew, only by coming to know Him face to face as a living reality through our own experience and life. All other knowledge of God can, at best, be but pale abstraction, which must, sooner or later, end in delusion.

The knowledge of God, here spoken of, is, in reality, only another form of faith, which, as is universally taught in the Scriptures, is the power bringing the soul into living communion and fellowship with the divine life. It is that form of faith which, through the understanding, joins our life in its deepest essence with the divine life as the truth, and which thus at once fills us with the divine life itself. Of faith, as including such knowledge, Dr. Nevin says that it is "an activity both of the understanding and will in their highest form, joining them together as one in the apprehension of the Divine Truth and the Divine Good—these by their everlasting marriage constituting, in fact, the inmost essence and substance of the Divine Life. Faith is no mechanical or magical appointment in this view, through which men are justified and saved in an outward way by having imputed to them what is, in truth, no part of their own proper personal existence or experience. It is the meeting of the human spirit inwardly with the enlivening rays that issue actually from the Sun of Right-

eousness. It is the turning of the soul within itself toward the Lord, and the opening of its inmost receptivity to the life that is forever flowing from His presence.”*

Now, it is of that kind of knowledge that the Saviour affirms that it is eternal life. Its effect upon the life of man is such that he himself becomes transformed into the glorious image of God. It places before him the high ideal after which his own life must be modeled, but at the same time also infinitely more. It brings him into such communion with the divine life itself that that life in the form of truth enters into his soul as the very substance of his being. Hence in the proportion in which he really apprehends God as pure is he himself made pure; as he thus comes to know God as holy, he is himself made holy; in as far as he comes to know God in His real character, he is made like Him. “But we all, with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit.” (2 Cor. 3: 18.)

If a concrete illustration were needed to show how our conception or knowledge of the character of God thus affects our moral life we might find it by comparing the two religions which were constantly struggling for the mastery in the history of Israel. As is well known, the question which Elijah propounded to Israel on Mount Carmel was the one great question before the Northern Kingdom. Was Jehovah God, or Baal? That was the question, and that determined not simply the religious worship of the people, but their whole moral life. In as far as the people accepted Baal and followed his worship they were dominated by the Phœnician morality; in as far as they were obedient to Jehovah they were controlled by the purer morals of the prophets. And, if we recall what the Phœnician conception of Baal was, as a personification of the productive powers of nature, we need not be surprised that his temples were little better than brothels, and that the influence of his worship was to degrade his worshippers to vices and immoralities which were worse than beastly. The worship of Jehovah, on the other hand, continually lifted the chosen people to ever higher and higher ideals of

* *Mer. Rev.*, Vol. 20, p. 478.

life and to ever purer and better morals, in the proportion in which they rose to an apprehension of His true character.

If this now is the influence of our conception of the being and character of God on our moral and religious life, we are prepared to go a step further and to raise our second question.

II. What is the particular influence of the Trinitarian conception of Deity upon the life of mankind?

As a starting point for our answer, I desire to recall the passage which I have already quoted from the Saviour's great high priestly prayer: "And this is eternal life that they should know Thee the only true God, and Him whom Thou hast sent, even Jesus Christ." Who is it that is thus addressed as "the only true God?" He is none other than the Father to whom the prayer is addressed. It is the knowledge of Him and of His son Jesus Christ that constitutes eternal life.

All, therefore, that we have affirmed of the influence of our conception of the character of God upon our moral and religious life must be affirmed of our knowing God as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Any other conception of His character which falls short of giving us the knowledge of Him as the everlasting Father will fall short of raising us up to the full height of the blessedness and glory which are implied in the fullness of eternal life. Other conceptions, in as far as they approach this one, may give us a measure of the blessedness of that life; but the fullness can be attained only in the proportion in which we rise to the conception of the character of God which is implied in His Fatherhood.

But what is it to conceive of God as Father? It is to conceive of Him as having in Himself the social distinctions which imply fellowship and love. Fatherhood implies Sonship; and God can be Father only if He is at the same time also Son. Hence, we can know Him as Father only as we know His Son Jesus Christ. And for the same reason we can have eternal life only on the condition of thus knowing Him as Father *and* Son—"thee the only true God, and Him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ."

But does not the fact of creation give rise to the divine Fatherhood, altogether apart from any such social distinctions in the divine Being itself? A man becomes a father, when in the unfolding of life children are born to him. May it not have been so with God? Did he not likewise become Father when, in the unfolding of the mighty plan of creation, He called a universe of intelligent beings into existence? We must undoubtedly answer in the negative? God is the same yesterday, to-day and forever; and He cannot become what He was not from everlasting. Man *becomes* what he is designed to be. The ideal of his life is reached through development and growth, and hence he can *become* a father. But not so with God. With Him there is neither development nor growth, but an everlasting *now*, in which He is the same as He was from everlasting. To conceive of Him as Father in His very essence, and not simply by accident, we must take our position, in thought at least, at that beginning when as yet created existence was not; and we must be able to affirm that then, when there was nothing but God, He was Father. But that at once implies that we must be able to affirm with St. John that in that beginning there was with God another, answering to the eternal Father, that is, an eternal Son.

This, however, carries us at once to the idea of the social distinctions in the divine Being, which is the essence of the Trinitarian doctrine. For whatever may be said of the third person in this relation, the essence of the doctrine consists in the fact that God is not a single solitary personality, but a Being with the social distinctions, capable of exercising love in the communion of His own Being. For our present purpose, we may assume as a fact of revelation that the social distinctions imply a triunity of persons and not simply a duality; and for the purposes of our argument it is sufficient now to recognize the fact that to conceive of God as Father, and so as a God of love, in the inner essence of His being, we must admit the social distinctions which form the basis of the Trinitarian conception.

But if that be true, then, according to the Saviour's own defi-

nition, we must affirm further that our having eternal life must in the end be dependent on our knowing God as triune. Of course, this again does not mean knowing Him in this character simply by way of intellectual apprehension, but in that deeper sense in which St. John uses the term, as including such experimental knowledge as brings us into living communion and fellowship with His very life and Being. It means knowing Him in His divine Fatherhood in such sense that we are at once impelled to lift our eyes to heaven and to cry, Abba Father.

This is the conclusion, as will be readily recalled, of the Athanasian Creed in its celebrated, but oft-condemned, anathemas. And while that Creed is open to serious objection in the way in which the conclusion is stated, the question may well be raised whether there is not a truth underlying even those condemnatory clauses which we have not always conserved. If the Saviour is correct in affirming that eternal life consists in the end in knowing the Father as the only true God, and if we have not seriously erred in our reasoning as to what is involved in the idea of the divine Fatherhood, then it must follow that in the end eternal life is bound up with our knowing God with the social distinctions and with the moral character which are implied in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

Can we justify this conclusion to our reason? Or is it one of those conclusions which, though it may seem logical, is yet repugnant to our moral consciousness?

Let us for a moment raise the question, What would be the result if the Unitarian conception were adopted? Suppose you deny the social distinctions in the divine Being, and what is the consequence? Your God becomes a single, solitary personality, infinitely exalted in majesty and power, but absolutely incapable of love in the essence of His Being. For it is necessary here again to take our place in thought in that beginning, when as yet created intelligences had no being. In that beginning, what was God, if He does not have the social distinctions within Himself? He may have been almighty; He may have been all-wise; He may have been great, and infinitely exalted in majesty and power;

but He can not have been a God of love, for love implies distinction of personality. The consequence will be that you get power as the one fundamental attribute of His Being, and you eliminate love from the essential attributes of His Being.

But what now would be the effect on the moral and religious life of mankind if you were to substitute a God of infinite power and might, a solitary and loveless Being, in the place of a Father of infinite majesty, who is full of love and compassion? Simply to raise the question is to make one shudder. It would be to take out of life everything that gives it value, everything that gives it hope and joy, everything that gives inspiration to duty or blessedness and beauty to sacrifice. You might fear a loveless and solitary Being, possessed of infinite power; but you could never love such a God: you might serve Him with the fear of a slave; but you could never worship Him with the devotion of a child. And not only would you thus take out of life all possibility of love to God, but of love to man likewise; for as St. John affirms, "We love, because he first loved us" (1 John, 4: 19). That is, love in us in any form is possible only because we have first of all experienced God's love toward us. It is God's love that awakens love in us; and wherever mankind has failed to reach the conception that God is love, it has likewise failed to make love the basis of its morality.

Mr. Richard Holt Hutton, who was once a Unitarian, but who has become convinced that that view of the divine Being is erroneous, after speaking of the social nature as the spring of love, goes on to say: "I can answer for myself that the Unitarian conviction that God is—as God and in His eternal essence—a single, solitary personality, influenced my imagination and the whole color of my faith most profoundly. Such a conviction, thoroughly realized, renders it impossible to identify any of the social attributes with his real *essence*—renders it difficult not to regard power as the true root of all other divine life. If we are to believe that *the Father* was from all time we must believe that He was *as* a Father; that is, that love was actual in Him as well as potential, that the communication of life and thought, and full-

ness of joy, was of the inmost nature of God, and never began to be if God never began to be.”*

What the moral life of mankind would be, if our fundamental conception of God were that He is first of all a God of infinite power, instead of a God of infinite love, we may perhaps be able faintly to realize, if we recall the conquest of Palestine under Joshua. As we know, the original conception of God which the Hebrews had was that of power. God was the El, the Elohim, the Elshaddai, the strong One, the Almighty. Joshua probably knew God as Jehovah; but he had not yet learned to know Him as a Father of love and compassion. For him the fundamental thought in regard to God was His infinite power and might. Hence he could interpret the inspiration, which he doubtless had, in a way which led him into the commission of deeds which are simply shocking to our Christian consciousness. Were a warrior to appear now who, under the pretence of a divine command, should begin to exterminate the whole population of an entire country, he would be branded as a madman and driven from the earth. Yet Joshua was a good man, far in advance of his age, honestly and conscientiously devoted to the true God. He doubtless had a genuine inspiration from the Almighty; but as we all must, he had to interpret the inspiration on the basis of the mental endowment with which he was furnished. He had to translate the divine afflatus into human thought; and in doing so he unconsciously colored it with his conception of the divine Being from whom the inspiration came. And that conception having for its basal principle the idea of power, he translated his inspiration into a form which vindicated the divine majesty through the unrelenting exercise of power. Hence he could destroy without mercy. His great misfortune was that, with his age, he had an inadequate conception of the true character of God. He lived in that twilight of revelation in which he indeed had some knowledge of God, but in which he as yet could not know God as He was afterwards revealed in Jesus Christ; if he had known God as primarily a God of love, instead of a God of power, he could not have done what he did without forfeiting his claim to being a servant of the

* Quoted by Stephens in *Doctrine and Life*, pp. 100, 101.

true God. Imagine, if you can, St. John, after he had leaned on Jesus' bosom, and after he had caught sight of that glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father—imagine him to have given the command to exterminate all the inhabitants of the land, men, women and children. It is impossible; but impossible, because St. John had a higher and better conception of the true character of God.

The only way in which we can have love as a quality in our moral life is by recognizing it as an essential quality in the divine life. "We love, because He first loved us." Hence any conception of God that will take away from us the deep and overwhelming consciousness that He is above all else a God of love must take away from us the inspiration which comes from the power of love. And it is easy to see what that would mean for our religious and moral life. As love is the sum of the law, so it is the substance of all morality that is worthy of the name. Hence all true morality is finally bound up with a conception of God which makes it possible for us to think of Him in His inmost essence as a God of love. And, as I tried to show, that is possible only on the basis of the Trinitarian conception.

While the doctrine of the Trinity, therefore, is difficult and beyond our power fully to grasp or explain, it is nevertheless most profoundly practical. There are few, if any, of the doctrines of our holy religion which are so far-reaching in their ethical import. Hence, while we may well abhor the anathemas of the Athanasian Creed on account of the uncharitable spirit which lies back of them, it is well for us to recognize that there is a truth underlying even those oft-condemned clauses, which the interest of truth compels us to conserve. Using the word "know" in the same full sense in which the Saviour used it in the passage above quoted, we are, I believe, safe in asserting that the blessings of eternal life can come to men only in the proportion in which they learn thus to know God as Father, Son and Spirit; for they can share His blessedness and life only as they become like Him, apprehending and reproducing in themselves that life of love which is at the basis of the social distinctions in His own Being.

IV.

CONSERVATIVE PROGRESS THE LAW OF HISTORY.

BY REV. J. I. SWANDER, D.D.

A general, yet careful, attention to the present trend of theological thought and earnest Church work in this country leads the close observer of religious phenomena to conclude that a knowledge of the philosophy of history is one of the essential qualifications in a successful ministry, as well as in a successful coöperation on the part of an intelligent laity. A measure of correct knowledge of the nature and law of the onflow of the world's life is absolutely indispensable to a proper performance of the work to which the Church has been commissioned. Such correct knowledge is always determined and molded by a proper conception of the constitution of the world itself. If there be for us a mere collection of inorganic aggregations our conception of its history will be that of a mere collection of chronicled facts. If, again, in the other extreme, we view the universe with Pope,

"As one stupendous whole
Whose body nature is and God the soul,"

we are in danger of plunging all being, all history and all progress into a consubstantial identity with the god of pantheism. But when we conceive of the world as having its being and moving in God without becoming in any sense identical with the Absolute One, and yet, in such sense as to have room for the indwelling of the divine, we occupy safe and logical ground, and find ourselves at liberty to put our own guarded construction upon Tennyson's

"One God, one law, one element
And one far-off divine event
To which the whole creation moves."

It is not safe to hold a conception of history with a recognition

of but "one element." We believe with the afore-named laureate in one God and one far-off divine event, but in at least two elements in the constitution of the world and its historic onflow to the end of time. These two elements are the divine and the human. They are essential. Sin is an element in the world, but not essential to its constitution. A contrary view would lead us to acknowledge sin as a necessity. But sin is not a necessity. If it were a necessity it would not be sin. It is not a positive force, but the actualization of a necessary possibility, and consequently the perversion of a positive force which obstructs the normal channel and impedes the normal onflow of the world's great history. If an element at all, it is only adventitious and foreign to the proper constitution of the world, and at most can never be regarded as anything more elemental than the dark background to the panorama of the ages.

The divine element or supernatural factor is concretely related to the human and natural factor in history, and this always in such a way that neither one passes by way of violence into the nature or mission of the other. The divine does not remain outside of the human, coöperating therewith in a Nestorian sense; neither does it become mixed with the human somewhat after the order of the Eutichean heresy. The divine is not merely an overshadowing spirit vapping in the abstract form of historicity within the realm of the human, leaving the latter to unfold its germinal powers in the form and process of evolution, thus corresponding with the Ebion heresy as over against a sound Christology.

Of course, what is expressed in the foregoing implies as in the following: All the forces and elements in the lower gradations of nature are contributive to the warp and woof of history, and should not be regarded as mere atomistic forms of being in no way connected therewith. In no other than this organic relation can they be conceived of as having any meaning whatever in the historic economy of the world. And only as thus viewed is there any manifest reason for the mountains and hills to break forth into singing, and all the trees of the fields to clap their hands at the coming of the Holy One of Israel who shall "in the dispen-

sation of the fullness of time gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth." Only under such organic and comprehensive view of the universe could the inspired Apostle regard the whole creation as waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God. And under no other view could Jesus of Nazareth appear as the Christ of history. He brings to the door of Time's greatest problem the key that unlocks the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God. It is in Him as the Head of creation that history realizes itself, becomes conscious of itself and glorifies itself. Hence, we have in Him the "fulfillment of the seasons, or the fullness of the times." Why not? Is not time the longitude of history, even as space is its latitude and glory to God in the highest its altitude?

The proper conception of history, therefore, starts in a recognition of the fact that the indwelling power of the supernatural enriches, ennobles and aims to enthrone the life of the natural world as it culminates in man—man individually and man collectively; man physically, intellectually and morally; man socially and geographically; man in all the possibilities, actualities and relations of his being; man from the dreams of his childhood to the goal of his attainable destiny. In fact, history is not entirely unlike the Church, the central channel of its onflow, possessed of the attribute of catholicity. It extends from the garden-gate of Eden to the portals of the New Jerusalem. It runs parallel with, if it be not in fact, the identical process by which the Church is gathered out of the whole human race from the beginning to the end of the world.

The Church is not the central channel of the world's history in any mere geographical sense. It is rather the most vital current of the world's movement because it involves in its constitution the central principle of the world's life. In the bosom of this current, and not upon the outside of it, as by some lapsarian decree, the divine purpose, concretely interweaving its supernatural warp with the woof of the human, guarantees the Church against all possibility of abortion, and secures to her the fulfillment of

her mission as she moves on "covering every relation of life, penetrating art, literature and philosophy, in conflict with the powers of evil, yet with ever-conquering flow, until these blending elements shall more perfectly their mystic mutual powers combine, and in the realms of life forever shine." In no other way and in no other sense can there be such glory to the eternal God, in the Church, by Christ Jesus throughout all ages.

Moreover, history, while centralizing its movement in the Church, must also come to a clearer and fuller consciousness of itself and of its mission in the embodiment of that Kingdom which ruleth over all. This is necessary to the full unfolding of man's ethical powers. What sense is there for man in an objective world unless it be taken up subjectively by human personality and apprehended through intelligent faith which not only knows that the worlds were made, but also that they were made with a unity of divine purpose to be organically unfolded as the years roll by. As well might the material heavens without the perceptive and apperceptive powers of human personality undertake to show forth the glory of God as now seen and declared in the light and by the application of the science of astronomy and in the proper use of the telescope, by which the otherwise distant worlds are rolled into the compass of a beautiful system. It is only thus that

"In Reason's ear they all rejoice
And utter forth a glorious voice."

In other words, a sound philosophy of history is just as important to an approximately correct measurement of God's plan in time and space as is a sound system of astronomy in any true reckonings pertaining to the forces and laws of the starry worlds. False astronomy, before the days of Copernicus, Kepler and Newton, led some of the false magnates of the Church to make fools of themselves; and even to this day a prevailing false philosophy of history is filling the world with a history of false philosophy.

The sound Christian philosopher always aims to see history in its essential relation to the historic Christ. Thus viewed it must of logical necessity live and move and have its being in one

principle of life. History dare not be viewed, as in Daniel's dream, like four beasts coming up from the sea, diverse one from another. It does not start in the lion to be followed by the bear until it makes room for the leopard with its many spots, to give way finally for the succession of an entirely different and terrible beast with its manifold heads and multiplied horns. No, the Christian philosopher's conception of history is different and better. If he views it as starting in the lion he will seek to see its continuity in the unfolding of the same principle of life until the same Lion of the tribe of Judah shall prevail to open the book and to loose the seven seals thereof. But if he sees, as in more appropriate metaphor, the great and all-comprehensive world movement starting in the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world he will never lose sight of its identity and unity as it flows on through the ages by the presence and power of Him who is the "End of a boundless pass, the center of a boundless present and the beginning of a boundless future;" as it accommodates itself to times and circumstances and the racial characteristics of the world; as it comes into conflict with the floodwood of a foreign element upon the bosom of its stream, or whirls its little eddies along the banks of its channel, until the end of all history shall have been reached in the fulfillment of God's purpose through the redemption and glorification of man, and the same Lamb, having opened the seven seals of Time's great book, shall be seen standing on Mount Zion, receiving the hallelujahs of the heavenly hosts.

This conception of history, therefore, excludes all possibility of anything like recurring events of similar significance. History does not repeat itself, except as the bud repeats itself in the blossom and the blossom in the fruit. Each takes up the life of its predecessor and carries it forward for further unfoldings by the ages to come. Especially is this true of Christian history. It is not entirely unlike the Christ of history, "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever," "whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting," and who yet increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man. Is it not probable that

He increased in favor with God and man because of His increase in wisdom and stature; and who will say that history does not grow in favor with all the rational and intelligent beings of the universe according as it unfolds itself in harmony with the law of its proper evolution. There can be no question that God looks with more complacency upon the historic records of those nations which are moving in the van of the world's higher types of Christian civilization as contrasted with the nations whose inferior order of life is unfolding itself in a less normal way and whose records are being written with a more spluttering pen. Take, for example, the degenerating power of Spain. It is ready to be spewed out of the mouth of the Most High. Her mission is measurably filled. In this condition nothing has been left her but Hobson's choice. Hence she was bottled up in Santiago harbor. So with those denominations in the living, growing Church of God. When their theology is completed, there is nothing more to do than to bottle it up in the standards. Not that the standards are wrong or useless. Not that they encroach upon the freedom of the Church's onflow. They at least serve to show the Church's apprehensions of the faith in the respective ages that give them birth. As such they record her historic progress through the ages as she goes forward to meet the Bridegroom, always bound to be free from the unwarranted exercise of arbitrary power, and yet free to be bound by the law of the spirit of life in the historic Christ.

To contend, therefore, for the faith once delivered to the saints neither warrants a contention over any form in which that faith may have formulated itself in any given age nor justifies the construction of anything like a new faith. To keep the faith, as indicated by the felicitous self-congratulation of St. Paul, is not to bury it like the slothful servant in some procrustean bed of fixed and finished orthodoxy, but to encourage its growth according to the law of its life that at the second coming of its Author and Finisher He may find His own with usury. This is the problem whose solution has been sought by all the intelligent Christian giants of the past. This is the theme that continues to inspire the

best anticipations of the future. Around this point revolves the most vigorous and incisive Church literature of the last half-century of years. From this principle the Reformed Church has evolved a distinctive order of theological thought more stimulating and refreshing to earnest Christian minds than all the sweet influences of the Pleiades. It was his earnest searching after this living pearl that led Dr. Nevin to find and proclaim something purer than Puritanism. As broad in his scholarly views as he was extensive in his reading and profound in his philosophic thought, he became the son of many fathers and the father of many sons. Stimulated by such view of the eternal truth, he exposed the religious quackery of the anxious-bench system of emotional religion, and at the same time assailed the unhistoric position of the Romish Church, while he pointed out and led the way for the Church of the Reformation to reclaim her inheritance as doctrinally set forth in the Heidelberg Catechism. And who will dare to say that, if he were with us now to witness the present trend of anticathechetical, unhistoric and unconservative progress in the Reformed Church, his voice would not be raised against the manifest drift of religious dissipation?

Dissipation.—Probably no other term is more expressive of the thought in mind and the theory in practice. Dissipation of force is usually the effect of misapplied and misdirected energy. Energy is misapplied in any attempt to use an organism or any order of organic being contrary to the essential law of its life. Take, for example, the violation of this law in the abnormal unfolding of the life of one of the noblest specimens in the brute creation. Who has not observed its effect upon the animal for which poor Richard would have given his kingdom. The result is degeneration in everything but ears, with no marked improvement at any point except in an acquired ability to bray, and the habit of using that ability to the great annoyance of the equinal side of its ancestry.

This inquiry after the law of conservation in the progress of history may be raised respecting the proper unfolding of the life of the Church or any denomination thereof. Proceeding, there-

fore, along the line of such inquiry it is assumed that there can be no controversy over the truth of the thesis: Only that which grows legitimately from an organism like the Church reformed, and yet continues in and of and for the said organism, can of organic necessity share in the nature, authority and distinctive mission thereof, as well as in the glory that may await it at the final completion of its history. Of course, the above also assumes and concedes that it is the Church's mission to take up into her organism whatever of assimilable elements she may have legitimate opportunity to lay hold of and to incorporate them as organic parts of her constitution.

This, however, is something very different from allowing foreign systems and customs, working by foreign laws, to come into the Church and remain until they are able to stand like an abomination of desolation in the holy place. Under this view these foreign agents and unassimilable elements become nothing less than religious parasites. And many of them seem to cling to the Reformed Church because, like the trees of the Lord, she is full of sap. It is presumed that no one will attempt to justify such false importations by a misconstruction and misapplication of the Apostolic commission. The Church has, indeed, been authorized to make disciples of all nations, but she has no authority to adopt the laws, baptize the customs and engraft the philosophies of the world into her own superior constitution of life and power. All attempts to do so have helped to mature the crises of her history. Let the Church as now reformed read and be profited by the admonitions and warnings she may find in her own records.

To this end a few questions are submitted for the consideration of those who may be disposed to think over the situation without a thirst for controversy. Is there not a foreign religious system engrafting itself into our Reformed Church? Is not this system gradually introducing its own theory and practice of religiousness? Does not a thorough analysis show it to be replete with dangerous error? Are not the dromedaries of Midian permitted to bring in too many foreign wares for the safety of our

home industries, the proper unfolding of our own life, the development of our own resources and the preservation of our own self-respect? Would it not be well for the Church to incorporate a little of the principle and apply a little more of the policy of protection against an unlimited importation of religious sentiment absolutely incompatible with her Reformed cultus? How do these importations view the Church of Christ as an organic constitution of life and power in and for the world? What views do they hold of the nature and purposes of the sacraments? Do they make proper account of the family as an institution of God's ordination? As related to the Church, is the Christian home regarded under any other view than that of a collection of individuals? What are the evidences of our legitimate religious growth? Is there not more expansion of plumage than of bird? How much increase has there been in the endowments of our colleges and theological seminaries during the last decade of great religious zeal and bustling activity? Are our benevolent operations fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, and according to the effectual working in the measure of every part making increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love? What effect is this new order of progressive peticity producing in the Christian graces of our children as they are drilled for their periodical rehearsals on dress-parade, before an "unusually large audience" of proud parents and applauding friends? What effect is now being produced from some cause and source upon a portion of our Church literature? Where is the man who has courage to say in public that much of it is deficient in thickness? Does it not speak well for the obedience of the children of the Church when they are willing to spend their money for that which is not bread, and equally well for the business sagacity of some editors when they spend their labor for that which satisfieth not the spiritual yearnings of a hungry yet loyal laity?

Having submitted the foregoing questions for the purpose of leading to serious reflection, let us now briefly examine some of the claims and apologies made in behalf of the exotic system al-

ready mentioned in the way of mild intimation. The claim is made that the plant is not an exotic—that it is of native growth in the Reformed garden of the Lord's house. If so, why does it produce such un-Reformed fruit? For samples of its fruit the reader is referred to the suggestive questions submitted in the foregoing paragraph. By others it is admitted to be an evil, yet something which had better be tolerated than antagonized. The plea is made that the tares, which were sown while the men of the Reformed Church are alleged to have been asleep as to the importance of evangelistic work, should be permitted to grow until harvest. Very well. But have we not already been harvesting the fruit of such tares for a number of years, and are we not now engaged in sowing the miserable stuff? In this case to harvest is to suffer; to sow is to sin. In other words, to change the simile, it is intimated by the new movement that the Reformed Church went to sleep on guard, that she was in great need of something from without to stir the fountain of her latent energy, and that it was her extremity which gave the unchurchly system an opportunity to organize the nineteenth century crusade to rescue the holy sepulcher from the possession of drowsy sentinels. It is not denied that the Church, like all denominations, and in fact all congregations of Christians, needed and still needs a revival of consecrated powers, but is it not a very thoughtless reflection upon the Church of martyrs to even intimate that it was necessary to bring such an awakening agency in from without? Such an importation might be necessary for some religious bodies, but the Church which a half-century ago rallied from within to drive the anxious-bench fanaticism back into its native religious wilderness needs no such help to roll away the imaginary stone from the alleged sepulcher. Again, it is claimed that we should make some radical departure from our usual and conservative line of progress in order that we may become more extensively known. Now, it is freely admitted that whatever light we have should not be put under a bushel, and if, indeed, it has been so put it should give transparency to the bushel until it illumines the world's pathway to glory. Otherwise it is no better than

the phosphorescence of those modern religious lightning-bugs that might do worse than to display a little rare modesty by creeping under a bushel. It should not be forgotten, however, that there is a sense in which the Church cannot be known by the outward religious world. Is it not a lamentable fact that popular religion fails to see the Church in her true constitution and mission? This is true of any Church in the proportion that she is, like her divine Lord, not of this world. Under this view

“'Twere no surprising thing
If we should be unknown;
The Jewish world knew not its King,
God's everlasting Son.”

It is only according to the true and historic revelation that the Reformed Church makes of herself that the light of which she bears witness generates, in the surrounding world, that organ of perception by which she may be known. It is well to be widely known. It is better to be well known. It is best to be correctly known. This is possible only as she legitimately unfolds the distinctive principle of her spirit and genius according to the law of proper conservative progress in history.

Furthermore, it is claimed that the Church is moving too slow—is not sufficiently alert and up to date. There is much truth in the claim, but not much relief in the new remedies proposed. Besides, it is an old excuse for a new form of pietism. The devil asked the Lord to make bread without leaven. False friends sought to make Jesus a King in a manner not according to the principles of His Messiahship. Luther did not move fast enough for the Anabaptists and other fanatics. Zwingli was too slow for the Iconoclasts of his age. And now the claim is made by many who have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge that the Church, to be true to herself, should go beyond herself. We admire the zeal but question the wisdom of much of its attempted application. The Reformed Church, as conservatively progressive, does not so much plead for old paths as for old principles, which should be allowed to unfold themselves in such new paths as the real necessities of proper environ-

ments may demand. We do not contend for old forms, but for the old faith which was once for all delivered to the saints, and to be of force always to put away all merely humanitarian movements so frequently offered as a substitute therefor. Yes, we emphasize the importance of and necessity for more progress in the Reformed Church. Let every legitimate effort be made to arouse and stimulate her native energy. The century is growing old, and we are challenged to an earnest continuance of the work which has always enlisted the sympathies and called forth the activities of the world's most consecrated men. Oh, for more proper views of proper relations between the constitutional functions and the legitimate efforts of the mystical and historic body in which God has given us to have part. There should be less spreading of canvas for the amount of ballast we have in the hold of the old Reformed Ship. The late war has shown an indispensable necessity in the victorious navy of the world. It has been demonstrated that even gunpowder is not more important than coal. Why? Because the power of propulsion is generated from bituminous ballast in the man-of-war. The same is true of the ocean liner. How forcibly this truth applies to the old ship Zion, the historic Church of the living God. Canvas may catch the shifting breezes that blow from all the points of the compass, but ballast gives strength and secures safety to the vessel upon a squally sea. This ballast includes the faith once delivered to the saints, and the honored tradition of the fathers bequeathed to the children. "We may, perhaps, not be willing to build our creed upon the coffins of the Reformers, nor to pin our faith to their shrouds; and yet we may believe that they were about as wise as their children are to know the right, and as piously disposed to choose it when known." (Dr. Bomberger.) Let the Reformed Church, by the application of that spiritual chemistry which has always characterized and enriched her laboratory, continue to generate her propulsive power from such ballast. Then will we be able to go forward, faithful in the position assigned us in history, and true to our trust as the flagship of Protestantism.

V.

CHRIST'S PERSON AND WORK IN THE LETTERS
OF PAUL.*

BY THE REV. A. S. WEBER, A.M.

The reconstruction of traditional forms of Christian thought is the leading task of modern theology. Multitudes of preachers and teachers everywhere have come to recognize this, and are earnestly and diligently addressing themselves to the performance of it. To those who, like most of the readers of this REVIEW, have long been regarding Christ as the center of religious life and thought, the all-sufficient source of Divine revelation, and the norm and measure of all our knowledge on religious subjects, it cannot be surprising that in these efforts at doctrinal reconstruction such particular stress should be laid upon the significance of the Person and Work of our Saviour. Christ, it has come to be realized, is "the way, the truth and the life" quite as much for human thought as for human conduct. What He is and what He wrought must interpret for us not only a part, but the entire domain of the Christian faith. Hence, the profound necessity, the great importance of correctly apprehending the picture of our Lord as it is presented to us in the New Testament Scriptures.

In the course of Christian history, there can be no doubt, various circumstances from time to time have succeeded, if not in hiding, at least in obscuring the true outlines of that picture.

* Literature : Beyschlag's New Testament Theology ; Adeney's Theology of the New Testament ; Gore's The Incarnation of the Son of God ; Gordon's The Christ of To-day ; Stevens' The Pauline Theology ; Bruce's St. Paul's Conception of Christianity ; Abbott's The Life and Letters of Paul ; Cone's The Apostle Paul ; Somerville's St. Paul's Conception of Christ. The last three are recent contributions and well worth possessing.

Metaphysical speculations, philosophical theories, ecclesiastical interests, individual fancies—these jointly and severally have wrought much mischief in this direction. Repeatedly, however, their influence has been thrown off, and in every instance it has resulted in giving a deepened interest to personal religion, and a new impulse to active efforts for the extension of the Master's Kingdom. In his brilliant book, *The Christ of To-day*, Gordon says: "Our modern world looks as if it were getting ready for a new conception of Christ. There is gathering from all points of the compass of serious religious thought, a volume of insight and appreciation of Him that must finally overwhelm the public mind with the sense of His absoluteness for humanity."* We concur with him in this opinion, and believe that with the advent of this new conception the experiences of history in similar periods of the past will be again repeated. There will be a general revival of religious life, of effort for the world's evangelization, of interest in theological science, and of devotion to the Kingdom of God on earth. In consequence of such revival there will be satisfying answers to many of the religious questions which are now distressing faith and occasioning doubt, and there will be solutions, also, of many of the social problems which are now perplexing Christian philanthropists in Church and State.

Thoughtful readers of the New Testament have always known that in it there are two methods of presenting the portrait of the Divine Man, of whose Person and Work a new conception is seemingly being wrought out. The one is that of the Synoptists who describe the Christ whom they personally were associated with, whom they saw and heard and followed in His journeyings up and down the roads of Palestine. The other is that of John, of the unknown author of Hebrews, and of Paul. They describe not as historians; they interpret rather as prophets and seers. It is not the Jesus of history that is held up by them to the mind of those that read their writings; it is the Christ of faith that is presented to the intuitions of their hearts.

Now, among the theologians of our day who are laboring to re-

* Pp. 29, 30.

cover the true view of our Saviour, there are not a few whose watchword is "the familiar though somewhat hackneyed cry," "Back to Christ," and who propose not only to overleap the centuries and to disregard the creeds and doctrinal systems of the Church, but to ignore likewise the interpretations recorded by the Fourth Gospel, the Book of Hebrews and the Letters of Paul. The audacity of their purpose need not prejudicially affect us in estimating its worth and significance. The movement back to the historical Christ, it must be gratefully acknowledged, has been of inestimable value, and the contributions it has made in the way of Lives of Christ, and otherwise, must be cordially welcomed. The entire Church has thus been brought to contemplate the Jesus of the Gospels with a new sense of reality. It is eternally significant and important for us to know His life on earth; how He lived and labored, felt and acted in the various circumstances of His daily life; how He dealt with men whom he met in their riches and poverty, their sickness and suffering, their sorrow and sin; how He thought of His relation to God and to men, and what He taught in regard to life and duty, death and immortality. A large class of thinkers insist that this is all that we need to know, or can know, of Christ and His Gospel. Van Dyke, for instance, in his Gospel for an Age of Doubt declares that "the Rock of certainty is the mind of Jesus expressed in His living words and speaking life. Beyond that we need not, and we can not go."* This, according to our reading of the Scriptures, is a one-sided and misleading notion, the general adoption of which by ministers of the Word would largely rob their message of its power. So far as our acquaintance with sermons, ancient and modern, allows us to judge, the really efficient preachers of the Gospel never limited themselves in its proclamation to a reiteration of the truths which Jesus taught and the commendation of His exemplary conduct for men's imitation. Have they not had much to say about what God in Christ has done in order to reconcile the world unto Himself, about the saving issues wrought out by the life and death

* Pp. 200, 201.

and resurrection of Jesus Christ, about the new life made accessible to every one that repents and believes—a new life including the pardon and remission of sin, power over temptation, strength and comfort in suffering and sorrow, victory in the hour of death? The hunger and thirst of needy souls is met by such preaching, and men longing for peace on earth and blessedness in heaven, have always been ready to welcome it, and to embrace its privileges and responsibilities. Would similar saving effects be accomplished were a man content to expound simply the moral precepts of Christ's teaching, to recite merely the truths of the Sermon on the Mount? Would the bare announcement of the great and blessed truths of the Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of men, and the glory of service avail for that purpose? We hesitate not to express our doubt, knowing that a sinful heart longs for something more, and reason demands that a Gospel from God shall supply it. To our mind Weiss is right in declaring it to be "an unpardonable historic blunder to suppose that the faith of primitive Christendom was based on the impression of the earthly image of Christ. A school might have been formed, a hero worship might have been instituted, had that been all; but a religion could arise only because the ancient Church was conscious that God had revealed Himself in the resurrection and exaltation of the Lord."* The fact and significance of these additional truths, proclaimed in connection with the meaning of Christ's death, constituted the Gospel a power for Christians in an early age, no less than in later ones that have successively followed.

This complementary side of the Gospel is recorded not by the historians who wrote the first three of the New Testament Books, but by the prophets and seers to whose inspiration we are indebted for the three classic interpretations of the Christ. These in our judgment, are necessary for the formation of a full and adequate conception of Christ and His work, and we believe them to have been providentially preserved for the purpose of affording in connection with the synoptic Gospels, the means of ob-

* *Die Nachfolge Christi*, p. 83.

taining such a conception. The first is the view of John who has been called the theologian of the Incarnation. He holds that Christ, the Word of God which in the beginning was, and was with God, and was God, is the perfect and final revelation of the eternal Deity. The second is that of Hebrews, whose author is the theologian of the Ascension and Exaltation. He regards Christ as the eternal High Priest, who by the sacrifice He in His own Person offered has fully satisfied for men's sin, and delivered them from its power. The third is that of the Letters of Paul who is the theologian of the Resurrection. He presents Christ from the view-point of His risen and glorified life with reference especially to the redemptive and sanctifying influence which that Life wielded in the case of Paul's own conversion and apostleship, and which it is qualified to wield in the case of all men.

This last view is to be examined at this time. The type of Christological doctrine to be discovered in so doing, we feel confident, is not in conflict with that given by the testimony of the historic Jesus Himself. Though reached in another way, his conclusions are simply what a logical and valid deduction or inference of Jesus' words and acts would warrant. And if this is so the outcome of our present inquiry should go to confirm the views reached in our paper on "The Witness of Jesus to Himself and Christianity" in an earlier number of this REVIEW.*

At the beginning of our proposed examination it may be well to make several preliminary observations of a general character with reference to the Letters of Paul, and the personal experiences in his life of which they make record. One of these observations is that those Epistles contain no systematic presentation of the doctrine of Christ's Person and Work. "It is wholly improbable," Stevens says, "that he ever applied his mind to the problem of defining the divine and human elements in His Person."† He never attempts to give an exact account of his ideas of Christ and His mission among men. His efforts were in-

* April, 1897.

† Pauline Theology, p. 199.

tended to persuade men that Jesus was the Messiah and that in Him provision was divinely made for man's peace and blessedness. By faith through grace eternal salvation was to be found in Him and in Him only. Hence instead of developing a doctrine of Christ's Person and Work, the apostle was satisfied to make simply such incidental references to Him as served the purposes he sought to accomplish in his preaching and writing. But whilst these references are fragmentary and constitute no complete picture, they are sufficiently numerous and comprehensive when brought together, to disclose as we shall presently see, a fairly definite portrait of our Lord as held by the mind of Paul.

Another of these observations is that the letters of Paul disclose the fact of development and progress in their author's Christological conceptions. In the epistles belonging to the earlier period of his apostleship there are certain conceptions of Christ which later in life, it is evident, no longer answered as expressions of the deeper convictions and loftier estimate of His Person and Work to which the Spirit under wider thought and more extended experiences had led him. The apostle gradually advanced to more exalted ideas of the nature of Christ and the functions He discharged in His work. This is saying simply that as an inspired writer Paul remained truly human and continued to live and think under the sway of ordinary psychological laws. He was not transformed into a machine which, in a mechanical way, wrought out or wrote out with entire perfection from the beginning what was divinely purposed or indicated. Like every living, thinking man, Paul developed, and with his development it was to be expected that there would be growth in his theological views, or, to hold more closely to our theme, in his Christological conceptions. And exactly that which might naturally have been expected, is to be found in his Letters. In Ephesians, Colossians and Philippians, which belong to his later years and mark the loftier intellectual and religious attainments of his Christian life, there are enriched conceptions of the character and greatness of our Saviour. He is regarded from new points of view, and the new ideas resulting call forth a new terminology in

reference to His supreme worth, authority and power. By employing such expressions as "all the fullness of God," "the image of the invisible God," "being in the form of God," "the Head of the Church which is His body," "the Head of all principality and power," the author of these Letters of the Captivity, emphasizes, as he had not done to the same degree in those to the Romans, Corinthians and Galatians, the distinctiveness of Christ's personal life and character from that of all other men. He expounds and enforces, also, not simply the doctrines and example of Jesus, but the redemptive significance for mankind of His life and death and resurrection. He solemnly affirms the supreme Lordship of Christ, as indicated by His enthronement at God's right hand, and maintains, at the same time, His constant and abiding union with those over whom He is appointed Lord.

The third observation to be made is that Paul's Letters contain but little information concerning the historical Jesus, and comparatively few references even to His teachings. It is correct no doubt to say, as it is put by one of the penetrating theological intellects of our day, that "the wonderful thing about the letters which compose so large a part of the New Testament, is the overwhelming consciousness of Christ that one finds in them. The writers are flooded with Christ. Their thoughts spontaneous and deliberate, their beliefs old and new, their ideals and enthusiasms, their uplift into heaven, their outlook upon the earth, are but different versions of the dominating soul of their Master. The whole movement of their existence is penetrated by His presence."* But it must be noticed that so far at least as Paul's writings are concerned, this is true only if the Christ here under reference is made to mean the Christ of glory. No one can carefully read his letters without meeting with the striking fact that, aside from his references to Christ's death and resurrection, and an incident or two such as the institution of the Lord's Supper mentioned in connection with those events, there is almost an entire silence as regards the gracious acts and loving words of the Lord Jesus. Why is this? It cannot be due to a want of

* The Christ of To-day, p. 49.

knowledge on Paul's part concerning the events of Jesus' ministry on earth, not to the supposition that those events would not have lent themselves to the purposes he was pursuing. Paul certainly must have known somewhat of Jesus long before his conversion; he must have known more after spending two weeks with other apostles at Jerusalem subsequent to it, and in his letters the knowledge of these facts "might well have been appealed to in illustration of the grace of Jesus and of those features of character in which He is an example to His people."

The explanation of this otherwise strange omission is to be found, we believe, in the entirely probable fact that for Paul the historic Jesus alone was not the promised Messiah. "The Christhood of Jesus in Paul's view," Somerville asserts without hesitation, "was not an accomplished fact till He had risen from the dead, and had entered on the higher stage of being and activity that followed. His earthly career, with all that distinguished it, was simply a preparation for, and a prelude to a fuller life and vaster progress in the souls of men that were to reveal Him in His true proportions as the Divine Christ. The knowledge of the risen Lord then was the essential thing to the understanding of Christ. And since only they who knew Him as glorified knew Him as the Christ of God, understood the real significance of His mission, and shared in the blessings He had come to give to men, we can see how natural it was for Paul to pass by the memories of Christ's earthly life, in his anxiety to set forth the greater glory of the risen Lord."*

And to this view, which commends itself to our approval, there is confirmation to be gotten, we think, by recalling the experiences, under which Paul became convinced of the Messiahship of Him who had lived meek and lowly among men. It was not by studying and reflecting upon the matchless beauty and transcendent wisdom of the teaching of Jesus, that Paul's heart was won, and the great transformation in his life wrought; it was the power and grace rather of the risen and glorified Christ personally manifested to him, and brought into actual fellowship with him, that

* St. Paul's Conception of Christ, pp. 9, 10.

accomplished this. Christ Himself, in distinction from His teachings, and hearsay reminiscences of Him—He it was that laid hold of Paul and led him into the light and liberty of "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God." These experiences and the results in his life consequent upon them were always vividly and joyously before his mind, and out of them, and his reflections upon them, there can be no doubt, there issued the conception of Christ which his Letters record.

The Christ of Paul, accordingly, may be called the Christ of his personal experience, and his Christological doctrines in this view are an account simply of that experience in terms suggested by thinking of and meditating upon it. In other words they are to employ a Ritschlian phrase, value-judgments (*Wehrurtheile*), of Christ based upon the impressions received, and the results accomplished in Paul's life of faith. If that is the meaning which is generally to be given to the obscure and widely-controverted "value-judgments" of theologians of the Ritschlian school, may there not be attaching to the expression more valid significance than many of us have hitherto been willing to grant? "The main want of the world," Carlyle has somewhere observed, "is men who really know God otherwise than by hearsay," and Paul knowing the God revealed in Christ from personal knowledge, would, if the dreamer of Chelsea is correct, supply a want for every generation in Christian history,—a want too seldom discoverable in those that essay to speak for Him.

If what we have sought to point out in these preliminaries is true, the importance of keeping the same in mind in an inquiry as to Paul's ideas of Christ and His work cannot be questioned. The fact is that without it much that his letters contain must remain an inexplicable mystery, with it we shall find their teachings luminous and self-consistent throughout.

The root-idea of Christ in Paul's mind is that in Him the archetype of humanity, the spiritual, the ideal man is revealed. He believed firmly in the true humanity of our Lord, declaring that He "was born of the seed of David according to the flesh," that He lived, sin excepted, the common life of men, that He

died as others, and rose again. With Him, as risen, Paul is brought into living touch and receives from Him on the ground of faith that which he recognizes to be the very Spirit of God. Under the power of that gift the spiritual that was in him regains its supremacy over the flesh. The possibility of bestowing this triumphing Spirit can reside only with One in whom the antagonism between flesh and spirit as known to fallen human nature does not hold, that is in the truly Spiritual Man. His resurrection and exaltation declare Him likewise to be the Spiritual Man, and with that objective declaration corresponds the testimony conscious to Paul's own heart of renewed moral and spiritual life.

The indwelling presence of God's Spirit with the Man of Nazareth is acknowledged by those who hold Him to have been an extraordinary man only; but this does not satisfy the language of Paul in his various letters. Even in those to the Romans, the Corinthians and the Galatians there is a conception of His person which a Socinian exegesis can explain only by doing violence to the plain meaning of their author. "Jesus Christ is therein coördinated with God," says Gore, "in the necessarily divine functions and offices both in nature and in grace, in a manner impossible to the minds of a Jewish monotheist like St. Paul unless the coördinated person is really believed to belong to the properly Divine Being. So complete is this coördination that, to quote the language of Professor Pfleiderer, we need feel no surprise when Paul at length calls Him without reserve "God who is over all blessed forevermore."* Whether we are willing to accept this interpretation put upon the particular passage quoted from Romans, with reference to which it is due to say modern scholarship is divided, it remains true nevertheless that Paul regards Christ as God incarnate, the Deity manifesting Himself in the Spiritual Manhood of Jesus the Christ.

To this unique character of the Person of Christ namely, the presence of God in human form, Paul refers Christ's freedom from sin, the spotless purity, the absolute holiness of His life and character. By the aid of the ever-present Spirit He triumphed our tempta-

* The Incarnation of the Son of God, p. 64.

tion in every shape maintaining the humanity in which He was born and to which no moral birth-taint of hereditary corruption attached, unsullied and perfectly righteous throughout His earthly career. What has appeared strange to many in the study of Paul's views regarding the divine human nature of Christ's sinless and holy personality is that in connection with his numerous references to it, there is not a word about the miraculous form of His birth as recorded by two of the Gospels. "Christ's supernatural birth," Cone writes, "is nowhere taught or assumed by Paul in his Letters,"* and in this the far more rigidly orthodox author of *The incarnation of the Son of God* agrees with him. "The one event commemorated in our Creed," he says, "which does not rest primarily on apostolical testimony and which was not part of the primary apostolic preaching is the miraculous conception and birth of Christ."† If this constituted no part of the teaching of the first Apostles it is less surprising that it should not have been noticed by Paul. "His silence on the subject cannot be used however," we think Adeney is right in arguing, "either for or against the historical facts in the case, because we have no ground for saying that he must have known what had happened, or if he had known it, he was under the necessity to write about it."‡ The omission of reference to this point simply shows that Paul rested his belief in the Deity of Christ on considerations that were quite independent of the physical mode of His birth. What the risen and exalted One had done for *him*, what he was daily doing for *others* who came to be members of His Church, *that* was the all-sufficient evidence sustaining faith in Christ as the ever-living Son of God continuously present with His people as the Source and Sustainer of their spiritual life, their indwelling Friend and Counsellor, their one assured hope of glory.

This "mystical Christ of Paul," as He has been called, introduces us to the deep secret of the Christological conceptions found

* *The Apostle Paul*, p. 292.

† *The Incarnation*, p. 84.

‡ *The Theology of the New Testament*, p. 176.

in his Letters. The richest contents of Pauline thought are not discovered when we come upon the universalism of Christianity as held by him in opposition to the clannish views of Judaism; not when we have learned with what emphasis he proclaims the doctrine of righteousness by grace through faith, in opposition to righteousness by law and works; but when we apprehend the spiritual truth which had been tested by himself, which may be tested by all, namely, that salvation in origin, growth and perfection is the result of the mystical union which subsists between Christ and His people. True believers in Christ are crucified with Him, buried with Him, risen with Him, glorified with Him, made heirs with Him of eternal joy and glory. Much of the phraseology peculiar to Paul's Letters gives expression to this characteristic conception of his with reference to Christ's permanent, living union with the individual members of our fallen race, and that in virtue of this union they are sealed unto the day of redemption. For Paul this was a demonstration that Jesus was the Christ of God, by the side of which all others were of but little value. In the possession of *it* he could confidently affirm "to me to live is Christ;" "Christ in me is the hope of glory."

In harmony with the recorded claim of Christ Himself, that all authority in heaven and earth belongs to Him, Paul everywhere in his Letters recognizes the risen and exalted One as Lord and Master. With the most unbounded veneration, the most unreserved and absolute self-surrender, he glories in the privilege of being a bond-servant to Him who had loved him and given Himself for him. And the same supreme authority for Christ is claimed, of course, with reference to all other men. He saw their helpless, lost and ruined condition, and therefore brought them salvation. He saw that by His government alone they could be rescued, and, therefore, at the cost of His own humiliation, He determined to exalt them. In other phrase He became one of them, that He might be their King, and that by their obedience to His authoritative will and commandments they with Him might come to wear royal robes, and sit with Him enthroned in the heavens. And in connection with this recognition of Jesus

as the King of men, who by His reign of love delivers them from the thralldom of sin to eternal life, there emerges also Paul's conception of Him as the eternal Judge. Christ is the Spiritual Man, the Son of God incarnate, sinless in life, perfect in character, mystically united with believers by the Spirit, their King and Saviour, and He is at the same time appointed also to be the Judge of all. The day is approaching when the risen and glorified God-Man shall return, *then* Paul writes, "God shall judge the secrets of men according to my Gospel by Jesus Christ."

To this bare outline of Paul's views of Christ as gathered from the group of his earlier Letters a word or two must be added as to the enriched form in which these same views are made to reappear in his later writings, and the new conceptions which then, for the first time, he announces. The new terminology by which all this is indicated in Ephesians, Colossians and Philippians has already been indicated. It remains for us now to inquire, however, what are the actual contents of the several characteristic expressions here found to be new to Pauline thought. One of these, common to the Letters sent to Ephesus and Colosse is "all the fullness of God." In Christ, according to these writings, "dwelt all the fullness of God;" in Christ, "it pleased the Father that all fullness should dwell." These new terms descriptive of Christ correspond, of course, with the designation of Him as the Spiritual Man and the Son of God, but they show an enlarged conception, a grander view of Christ's preëminent worth, in the mind of Paul. Whilst there is an almost entire absence of direct reference to the Holy Spirit in the Epistles of the Captivity, the fact is that "the fullness of God" endowing Him means that Christ has the life-giving Spirit in all the plentitude of His power abiding with Him. When he speaks of Christ as having "all the fullness of God dwelling in Him," the Apostle ascribes to Him the all-inclusive enduement of spiritual life and divine power needed by men for their salvation. What precisely the occasion was that led to the adoption of the new term instead of properly qualified others that had been previously employed, we may not be able to learn, but "there can be no doubt the expression was

intended to convey to us a profound impression of Christ's inexhaustible value for the religious life of man."*

"The image of the invisible God" is another term that is new in Paul's later Letters. In his second Epistle to the Corinthians, it is true, he had referred to Christ as being in "the image of God," but from the context in which the expression occurs in a changed form in Colossians it is evident that the idea of Christ which it involves has grown out of the loftier and more transcendent conception of the nature of Christ and His work now held by Paul. We agree with those commentators who insist that this expression is not meant to predicate anything as to Christ's pre-incarnate Being, but that it is intended to differentiate Him from others who may be spoken of as made in the image and likeness of God. Christ is "the image of the invisible God" in the sense that in Him there is a perfect embodiment, a complete revelation of the hidden character of God. This can be said of no one else. Through our union with Him we may, indeed, share the glory of His image, and receive somewhat of the fullness which He possesses, but whatever we have is derived from Him who is clad in Divine glory and in whom all the fullness of the Deity dwells. "The image of the invisible God" suggests that in Christ there is the new-creating, the supporting and the sanctifying energy of God's Spirit adapted to the needs of all the varieties of type and condition in the race of man.

The other new terms "Head of the Church" and "Head of Principalities and Powers," are, if possible, still richer in content and suggestiveness. Plainly they are a development of the earlier ideas of Christ's Lordship and His mystical union with men, so as to make these conceptions applicable not simply to individuals but to the Church and the entire world. By the Church the Headship of Christ is acknowledged. He is regarded as the authorized Ruler of her members, exalted over them, but, at the same time also, organically united with them just as the head is with the body. The qualitative, as well as the quantitative, distinction between Christ and other men seems clearly implied and

* St. Paul's Conception of Christ, p. 159.

no doubt designedly so by Paul. By the principalities and powers Christ's Headship may not as yet be acknowledged, but the fact of it is none the less established by Divine decree. The Father has given Him "the name which is above every name that in the name of Jesus every knee shall bow of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

This exaltation of Christ to universal Headship is in Paul's view the grandest instance of recognition by the Father of the Son's infinite worth, and, in connection with reference to it, he comes to speak also of the preëxistence of Christ, of His preincarnate life with the Father in heaven. In regard to this doctrine it must be said Paul's affirmations are not based, as in the nature of the case they could not be, upon the experience of his own Christian life. The eternal nature of Christ is not verifiable by the Christian consciousness, and for that reason, among others, it may be Paul was content to refer to it rather seldom, and then only in an inferential or incidental manner. Richard Holt Hutton has drawn a comparison between Paul and John on this point which places the former far beneath the latter, who, it is clear, had not attained, he thinks, to the fullness of view and conviction shown by the author of the Fourth Gospel.* But in passages not a few Paul takes for granted the preëxistence of Christ and most of us will be inclined to accept the judgment of Bayschlag on this question, who says that in all these implications Paul "presupposes the doctrine as familiar to his readers and disputed by no one."† To the Galatians he writes that "God sent forth His Son," which implies the truth of the doctrine under consideration. To the Romans he declares that "God sent His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh," which is an implication to the same effect. To the Corinthians he affirms distinctly that in coming into the world Christ exchanged a state of riches for one of poverty—a voluntary exchange to which Paul appeals as a sublime

* Cf. Theological Essays, Vol. 1, p. 250.

† New Testament Theology, Vol. 2, p. 78.

instance of self-sacrifice worth imitating. And to the Philippians he speaks of Christ as "being *originally* in the form of God," as the marginal reading of the Revised Version translates this classical passage. It assumes the same truth, and in connection with all the rest, are we not warranted to hold that it establishes, beyond a peradventure, that the doctrine of Christ's preincarnate life, eternally with the Father, had the full consent and hearty approval of Paul's mind. Unquestionably he was unable, even as we are, to fathom the mystery of the nature of Christ's premundane existence or to explain satisfactorily His transcendent relation to God, but he was not hindered thereby from bowing reverently before what, by reason of Christ's Work, he was compelled to recognize as an essential fact of His Person. The recognition of this must have brought him great aid in following Christ as his Master, in loving Him as his Saviour, and in worshipping Him as his God.

In taking this necessarily hasty and partial survey of the teaching of Paul's Letters in regard to Christ's Person, it has been convenient in a number of places to anticipate their teaching also as regards His Work. What has been said is insufficient, however, to convey an adequate idea of the principles governing their author in estimating the value, and indicating the redemptive significance of the Work of our Lord. Within the space to which we are limited nothing like a full consideration of this great subject can be attempted, but the trend of Pauline thought may in a general way be indicated. As has been already seen, the Christ who had died, and risen again, and who in His exaltation had brought Himself into touch with Paul, had proved Himself in his case a mighty redeeming power. From Him he had gotten the strength by which the spiritual in him had triumphed over the carnal, and brought him into a new and consciously filial relationship to God. His sins he knew to have been pardoned, their power over him to have been destroyed, a new creation in him to have been effected, and a new disposition of love to the Divine Will to have been established. In the light of these personal impressions made by the Lord of glory, and in the joy of the hallowed results which were consciously his by the grace

of God, Paul interpreted not simply the nature of Christ's Being, but the significance of His Work, a significance that reached out towards and embraced all men. Deliverance from the doom of sin in forgiveness, liberation from sin's power in the quickening of the new life, these were by the Life and Work of Christ provided for all who should believe in Him.

This far-reaching saving significance of Christ's Work, whilst involving the very Being of His unique Person, and the Divine mission of His holy and obedient life, is attributed by Paul principally to His death, in connection with which, not infrequently, he mentions also His resurrection. In page after page of his earlier and later writings, the Apostle shows how close in his view is the connection of Christ's death with the forgiveness of man's sin and his restoration to favor with God. Without teaching that Christ's death was needed to win the love of God for us, or to overcome the Father's reluctance to show mercy to His disobedient and rebellious children, Paul's Letters constantly emphasize the thought that it is on the ground of what Christ did when He died, that God is now dealing with men on the principle of grace, forgiving their sin and receiving them into His fellowship, the one condition to be complied with by men being faith in Him with whom as risen they are now organically one through the Spirit. Christ's death is regarded as a revelation of the love of God's heart, a manifestation of His willingness to stoop and to suffer in order to save. But it is regarded also as an act of redemption in the sense that by virtue of it an objective benefit from God has been won for us. How these two factors of Paul's conception of Christ's death as revealing God and redeeming man are to be reconciled is the difficult problem which theology has to solve. The virtue of His death accrues to those only who by the bond of a vital faith are one with the risen Christ in His resurrection. By faith through grace we come, in Paul's view, to be "planted in the likeness of His resurrection," and, therefore, can grow, advancing from glory to glory in the process of our sanctification, a process of spiritual growth which is to result finally in our attaining unto a full-grown manhood, "unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

These conceptions interpreting the significance of our Lord's death and resurrection are to be found in a more or less developed form in all of Paul's writings. In those belonging to the latter period of his career the importance of Christ's death is naturally emphasized somewhat more strongly and given a far wider application. Earlier in Paul's life Christ's death was for him the means by which men were reconciled to God, whilst later it is conceived of as being the power of reconciliation between man and man, and even of removing the dualism between man and the angelic intelligences.* In the earlier Letters Christ's resurrection is contemplated from the narrower viewpoint of its relation to individual redemption, whilst in the later Epistles it is made significant for the whole universe.

To enter into the important questions why in Paul's conception it was necessary for Christ to die, wherein consists the efficacy of His death, and how that efficacy avails for our salvation, is not within the compass of our present purpose. We content ourselves with the simple statement of facts as they are to be found in Paul's Letters, without attempting to discuss the various theories of the Atonement that have arisen very largely from the different explanations given by earlier and contemporary theologians to the language of Paul. As we come, under the leadership of modern Biblical research and study, to know the teachings of Paul's Letters more thoroughly and accurately, we shall be enabled more fully to understand the nature of Christ, and thus to gain a clearer apprehension also of His saving work.

Meanwhile it may be well to remember some of the grateful and remunerative results which have already been brought to the thought of the Church by the new study which our age is giving to the Letters of Paul: It has confirmed the view that for an adequately full conception of Christ and His work, the historic narratives of Matthew, Mark and Luke need to be supplemented by the interpretations which other inspired men have given to His Person and Work in writings of the New Testament. It has established, as we believe beyond the possibility of successful con-

* Cf. Ephesians 2 : 14-16, with Colossians 1 : 19.

tradition, that Paul's interpretations, whilst due to his personal experience, might be rooted in the implications and even the very words of Christ, and that in contributing to a larger and richer conception of Him, his interpretation does not contradict the Gospel narrative, or exaggeratively suggest for Christ and His Work what belongs not to Him. It has shown that, according to Paul, Christ in His death acted not only on God's behalf, thus revealing His love and winning ours in response; but also on our behalf, thus offering to God what we ought to have offered, but in our sinful weakness could not. It has proved, in consequence, that the so-called "moral-influence" theory of the Atonement takes cognizance of only one feature of Pauline thought, and by neglecting the other must forfeit its claim to our acceptance of it as adequate. It has relieved Paul from the charge of responsibility with reference to the view that Christ's death secured man's forgiveness in virtue of its being the vicarious endurance of *punishment* which was due to those that had transgressed the Divine law. It has brought us the assurance also that, whilst we owe our redemption from sin and the gift of a new spiritual life to Christ's death and resurrection, the benefits of such pardon and life are to be realized by us only in the ethical process of a life of faith. Paul does not share with Roman and High Church Anglican theologians of our day their magical notions of the Sacrament of Baptism. The merits of Christ's death, the life of His resurrection, cannot be transferred from one to another in a mechanical manner, or through use of formal ordinance. To obtain the Divine favor and to share with Christ the inheritance of life eternal, we must by the Spirit be incorporated into Christ, and by a life of faith reconciling us to God and His will attain in humble obedience to it, eternal blessedness.

Let us be devoutly grateful for the historic portraiture of Jesus given us by the Gospel. We could not do without it. Let us be grateful also for the several additional lines put on that portrait by the inspired mind of Paul. Could the membership of the Church do without them? The presence and providential preservation of his Letters in the sacred Canon is a sufficient answer.

VI.

THE MISSIONARY PROBLEM IN JAPAN.

BY REV. D. B. SCHNEDER.

What features of the missionary situation in Japan are there to discourage, and what other features are there to encourage, the hope that Japan will within a comparatively short time, say three or four generations, be Christianized? By Christianization let such a degree of progress be implied that Christianity will be the dominant religion of the country, both so far as numbers and so far as influence are concerned.

Taking up first the side of the discouragements, it is to be noticed, in the first place, that the natural traits of a people have much to do with the adoption of a religion. The natural traits of the people of Japan contain elements which stand as hindrances to the introduction of Christianity. Of these their intense feeling of nationalism is one. The Japanese have from time immemorial looked upon their country as sacred and upon their Emperor as the Son of Heaven. The third article of the new constitution, which went into effect in 1890, is as follows: "The Emperor is sacred and inviolable;" and the official commentary upon the article written by Marquis Ito, a man who spent many years in travel and study in the Occident, runs as follows: "'The Sacred Throne was established at the time when the heavens and the earth became separated.' The Emperor is Heaven-descended, divine and sacred; he is preëminent above all his subjects. He must be revered and is inviolable. He has, indeed, to pay due respect to the law, but the law has no power to hold him accountable to it. Not only shall there be no irreverence for the Emperor's person, but he shall not be made a topic of derogatory comment nor one of discussion." The imperial ancestors are even to-day made the objects of divine worship, and before a diplomat to a foreign country takes his leave he must appear at the imperial

cenotaphs and, worshipping before them, swear fealty to the Empire. The one native religion of Japan, Shintoism, has for its chief tenet the worship of these ancestors, and makes loyalty to the Emperor the highest form of religious devotion. When Confucianism entered the country from China the highest virtue of its moral code was that of filial piety, or the spirit of reverence and obedience toward parents; but the spirit of Japan required a change in the order, and for centuries now, not filial piety, but loyalty has stood as the highest virtue of Confucianism in Japan. The fact, therefore, that Christianity is in Japanese eyes a foreign religion, and that its missionaries are foreigners, is by no means favorable to the cordial reception of this religion into Japan. It is true that the anti-foreign feeling which meets the missionary so often in his work is not without some excuse. It is not improbable that the Spanish and Portuguese missionaries had some designs upon the reins of power in the sixteenth century; at least the Japanese believed so; and it was in consequence of this belief that they drove out the missionaries then, closed the country for two centuries and a half against foreigners, and put up all over the Empire the famous edicts which prohibited Christianity under such fearful penalties. Even in modern times foreign nations and foreign people have not always been governed by the dictates of right and fairness in their dealings with the Japanese. But no matter how much justification there is for it, that does not alter the fact that the spirit of antipathy toward foreigners is there, and that it constitutes a serious barrier to Christianity. But much more still does the fact that Christianity places God above all earthly potentates, that it makes obedience and devotion toward Him the highest virtue, and that it looks upon kings and emperors as men of like passions and sins and weaknesses as other men, militate against its free and untrammelled introduction into Japan. It is here that the new religion touches the tenderest spot in the national feeling. To the family of the Emperor have been belonging about twenty concubines, and the present Crown Prince is the son of one of these women, a state of things against which Christianity is a standing condemnation, and in spite of

every effort to avoid unnecessary offense, while presenting at the same time the truth in its integrity, the progress of Christianity will for generations to come suffer serious hindrance from this source. Missionaries will be in danger of stirring up the national feeling unduly, and native workers will be tempted to trim their sails to such an extent as to rob their preaching of its power, and between the two the work of Christ will be hampered without doubt very greatly.

Again, the charge of fickleness has been made against Japanese character. The Japanese are quick but mercurial. They are vacillating. They lack stability. They are carried hither and thither with the direction of the wind. They have been too ready to borrow from other nations, too quick to fall in with new ideas, and too ready to reject them before they were half tried. They introduced Buddhism from without, and then Confucianism. They took their philosophy and their literature from China, their art from Korea, and now they are taking their extensive systems of modern improvements from America and Europe. Even the very degree of readiness which they have shown to accept Christianity is scored against their disposition as a people. In reply it can be said that it has always been the peninsular and island countries that have stood in the forefront of progress, rather than the nations with vast inland populations, like Russia in the Occident or China in the Orient. The fact, therefore, that Japan will be from fifty to a hundred years ahead of China in the adoption of Western civilization should not be regarded as necessarily discreditable to the stability of her national character. Moreover, it is not certain that Japan's present extreme disposition in favor of change and experiment is one of her permanent traits. Japan has the oldest unbroken dynasty in the world. For two centuries and a-half she maintained with iron firmness her position of self-isolation. Buddhism has been her religion for over a thousand years. She manifests her love of stability in the maintenance of her old family lines with unyielding tenacity. Her apparent lightness and instability is most probably to a large extent rather the inevitable accom-

paniment of the transition stage through which she is passing, the peaceful political and social revolution which she is undergoing. She feels that she is in the midst of a formative epoch, and that it is better to change readily now than to make permanent mistakes. Nevertheless, however transitory the present undue disposition to change may be, the important fact is that the disposition exists, and will continue to exist yet for decades, and that it is a serious hindrance to Christianity in its process of rooting itself in the individual and in the social structure. The Japanese Church cannot be as strong, as stable and as certain for the future as it would be without this feature of the situation, and the process of Christianization will, on this account, be undoubtedly much prolonged.

Secondly, the old religions. The traces which Buddhism and Shintoism have left upon the life of the people of Japan constitute hindrances to Christianity which it will take many years to overcome. Even if all Japan could suddenly in some way become Christian in a day, the deleterious effects of the old faiths would linger and go far to neutralize and pervert the quickening power of the new faith. The first of the old religions is Shintoism, a native of the soil. While this religion took its form from the innate spirit of nationalism on the part of the people, it on its part became the cultivator of a still intenser form of this spirit. The result is not only the natural opposition to a religion that is both foreign and opposed to the virtual deification of the Emperor, but another consequence is that the Japanese mind looks at all things from a nationalistic standpoint. The time when Japan can fully grasp the Christian truth that the individual in itself considered has infinite worth, and that the true nation can consist only of fully-developed, self-conscious and self-controlled individuals, seems to be far in the distance. Buddhism, as we have seen, through its pessimism, infused into the people a spirit of hopelessness and resignation to fate. It paralyzed aspiration. Through its pantheism it dimmed the sense of personality; it weakened the God-consciousness, the self-consciousness and the world-consciousness of men. It enfeebled the will. It obliterated

the sense of sin. It contracted the sphere of the soul. It opened no glorious vista of conscious life in an eternal communion of love with a holy God and the perfected saints of all ages. Confucianism, while it earned the boundless gratitude of Japan, also inflicted deep wrongs. It laid extravagant emphasis upon the duties of inferiors to superiors, but said little about the debt of superiors to inferiors. It consigned to neglect some of the most essential virtues of a righteous life. Not only do the people of Japan show a notorious shortcoming in matters of truthfulness, honesty, reliability and chastity, but they also make it plain that their very sense of moral right is warped and twisted by the ethical teaching under which they have lived for centuries. Moral judgments differ from those of Christian lands. Vice abounds without being considered vice, and good often fails to be recognized as good. Altogether, the spiritual nature of the Japanese people has become hardened by their old religions and their old morality in a state of woeful perversion. These people have not only not inherited Christianity, but they have for centuries been under training and influence that has in many respects been positively evil and disastrous.

But possibly the deepest impression more or less consciously received by the Japanese people from the faiths under which they have lived is that of *failure*—failure in satisfaction of the fundamental religious instincts of the human heart. The first consequence of this failure has shown itself for centuries already in the widespread and to-day very prevalent disposition to cease to regard religion as a spiritual power, but to look upon it only as a sort of a charm for the acquirement of material benefits. It is very largely true to-day that whatever religious fervor there is among the Japanese people has for its chief motive worldly prosperity. People pray for good health and for the prosperity of their families; parents pray for good marriages for their sons and daughters; officers pray for promotion; merchants, for wealth; farmers, for good crops; fishermen, for large hauls of fishes, and think that is about all that religion is for. Sadder still is the fact that religion has accommodated itself to this de-

grading view, and that Shintoism and Buddhism vie with each other in making bids for popularity on the basis of hopes held out for material advantage. Ten years ago a new Shinto sect, called Teurikyo, arose. Its founder was a simple-minded woman who often fell into trances. To-day the sect has over five million believers, fifty times the number of Christians, and it is the most flourishing religious body in Japan! And for one reason only, namely, that it is the most directly materialistic in the blessings it professes to confer. It is not surprising, therefore, that the state of the Japanese mind as found at present is exceedingly unspiritual, and the very conception of religion prevailing among the masses of the people is that it is chiefly a means of securing temporal good, or of escaping temporal evil, in a supernatural way.

A further consequence of the profound religious insufficiency of Buddhism and Shintoism, and the distorting and stagnating effects of the Confucian morality has been, especially in recent times, a growing feeling of dissatisfaction, distrust and repulsion toward them. The widespread religious indifference and scepticism, and the alarming increase in moral laxity of every form prevailing to-day, are largely the consequences of this feeling. Most educated men have been led to look upon religion as a foolish superstition which hampers the free development of individuals and nations. The Japanese government school system, which General Grant in 1878 already pronounced the best in the world, and which is wielding tremendous influence over the future of the nation, is unmoral and anti-religious. What moral instruction is imparted woefully lacks in consistency and seriousness, and religion is despised and ridiculed. This is especially true of the two hundred and thirty institutions of higher learning, which constitute the pathway to nearly all positions in the political, educational, professional and industrial life of the Empire. The fifty thousand bright, promising young men in these schools are being trained into moral abandon, into contempt for religion, into agnosticism and atheism.

And yet in spite of the extensive feeling of dissatisfaction and indifference toward the old religions, they nevertheless still con-

stitute a factor of positive opposition to the spread of Christianity. The large body of the priesthood are naturally the foes of Christianity, and the proportion of the people who still cling to them are not less hostile. The priests are busy in endeavoring to awaken prejudice against the new faith, by misrepresentation, by appeals to feelings of nationalism or of devotion to ancestors or of selfish interest. Occasionally there are open and violent attempts to hinder Christian preaching. However, there is also some intelligent opposition. Many of the priests are acquainted with the main doctrines of Christianity. Some of them have given these doctrines as well as the history of Christianity careful study, and their attacks are sometimes characterized by surprising skill and effectiveness. Advantage is being taken, especially by Buddhism, of the superior methods of Christianity. There is in recent years more regular preaching than there had been formerly. Young Men's Buddhist Associations have been started in imitation of the Young Men's Christian Associations of Christianity. Buddhist Sunday-schools have been opened for the instruction of children. Buddhist conferences or retreats are held for the discussion of topics pertaining to the doctrines or practices of Buddhism. Buddhist papers, magazines and tracts are legion, and there is a growing disposition to take hold of charitable work and social reform. The motive of all these efforts is to offset the favorable impressions made by Christianity, and to re-galvanize the old faiths into new manifestations of life. All of this is, of course, in a degree effective. The old religions are still nearest the hearts of the people, and if they can vindicate their claim to confidence, with even only the appearance of the success with which Christianity can, they are able to hold their place as over against the new religion.

This distortion and degradation of the Japanese mind and heart by the old influences to such an extent as to be almost a second nature, and the indifference to religion in general, and the positive antagonism to Christianity in particular so prevalent to-day, present to the work of missions a situation of unspeakable difficulty. In the presence of it the missionary is often over-

whelmed with the feeling of the utter hopelessness of his efforts. He feels as one beating the air or trying to make water run up hill. He finds no point of connection between the Japanese mind and the spiritual religion which he presents. What impresses him profoundly leaves no apparent effect upon his hearers. His ideas do not fit into the habits of thinking of the people. For some of his conceptions there are no suitable terms in the Japanese language. For the conception of God he is obliged to use a term which may mean any one of the eight million Shinto divinities, all of whom are according to Japanese ideas far inferior to our idea of God. There is no term for sin, the nearest approach to it being a word that means violation of civil law. Moreover, multitudes about the missionary day by day look upon him as being himself deluded or as deliberately trying to delude others for selfish ends, and their consequent attitude is one either of supercilious contempt and pity or of aversion and bitterness. People who listen to him are ostracized and despised. Altogether in the face of these things there can be no other conclusion than that the progress of genuine Christianity must be slow; that there must be patient teaching for many decades, "precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little and there a little."

Thirdly, the opening of Japan to foreign intercourse and the rapid influx of the material and many of the spiritual elements of Western civilization, which is undoubtedly an untold blessing to Japan, has also brought with it some circumstances that augment the difficulty of missionary work. The lives of those from Christian lands who have gone to Japan in the capacity of business men or tourists are by no means always of such a character as to win respect for the religion of the countries they represent. Many of these make no profession of religion themselves and sneer at the efforts of those who endeavor to teach it to the Japanese. The inflow of Western sceptical and agnostic literature has been great. The works of Comte and Spencer especially attained a very wide circulation. Again, from the day that Commodore Perry knocked at the gates of Japan the country has

been in a state of constant and profound unrest. There have been rising and receding waves of feeling toward foreigners and foreign nations. There have been two civil wars and one with a foreign nation. The country has undertaken to try the experiment of constitutional government, and scarcely a year has passed that did not witness some momentous change or critical forward step. The effect of all these things is, of course, harmful to the genuine and steady progress of Christianity, which entered the country already in 1859. The people have not been in a position to think calmly and collectedly about things spiritual. The frequent ebb and flow in popular sentiment has made it impossible for any deep impressions to abide and become permanent.

Coming now to the actual history of the missionary work that has been done during the past thirty-nine years in Japan, we find a great deal that reflects the discouraging features that have been spoken of. The work has been greatly affected by the waves of popular sentiment that have swept over the country. Between the years of 1879 and 1889 there prevailed such an indiscriminate desire for things foreign that it amounted almost to a craze. Foreign forms of material civilization, foreign methods of education, and foreign styles in art, foreign clothes, foreign food and foreign dancing were introduced with amazing precipitation. And Mr. Fulsuzawa, the "sage of Japan," raised his voice in favor of Christianity, the foreign religion, claiming that the Western religion and Western civilization were of a piece, and that one could not be taken without the other. It is scarcely necessary to add that the work of missions, under such circumstances, went rapidly forward. But these things could not last. The inevitable reaction came, and it was long drawn out and powerful. The progressives had gone too far; the conservatives now had their inning and they used it with telling force. The cry "Japan for the Japanese" was raised, and "*Yamato Damashii*, or the spirit of unconquerable Japan," became the watchword of the young men. The foreign nations were charged with injustice in the matter of treaty relations, and the feeling of the people toward the foreigners within their borders and toward the foreign re-

ligion gradually became very bitter. Christian work began to progress slowly. Many who had accepted the faith when it was popular fell away. It was then that the work was called upon to face its natural and real difficulties as never before. In the year 1894 the war with China broke out, Japan won prestige among the Occidental powers, new treaties were made in which Japan was recognized on terms of equality with the Great Powers, and the country was put into better humor again with the foreign nations and the foreign religion. However, there has been no return of what may perhaps be called the mushroom growth of Christianity previous to 1889. The work has continued to progress slowly. Encounters with the various opposing forces which have been mentioned are matters of daily experience. The ultra-nationalism of the people manifests itself among non-Christians and among Christians. Among non-Christians it shows itself in an attitude of steady opposition. "Japan has shown herself able to take care of her interests in other respects; what need has she of foreign teachers of religion?" is a query that expresses a widespread feeling. Among Christians the feeling of nationalism manifests itself in a desire for a Japanized Christianity, in a disposition to cringe in the presence of popular sentiment, in resentment against what is regarded as undue foreign influence in matters pertaining to the management of the work and the control of moneys. The present unsteadiness of the people, the spiritual distortion produced by the old religions, the religious indifference and the antipathy toward religion, all manifest themselves in many ways. One of the most discouraging features of the situation is the virtual apostasy of men who once were among the most zealous exponents of Christianity. Years ago a band of about a dozen young men near the city of Kumamoto went out upon a hilltop and there made a solemn vow that they would labor to enlighten the darkness of the Empire by preaching the Gospel even at the sacrifice of their lives. After completing their studies they for years fully justified the expectations raised by the intensity of their early devotion. But to-day out of the twelve one has abandoned his faith entirely; an-

other is practically a Unitarian; another has left the ministry and entered business; another is an ultra-rationalist; still another gave up work in a Christian school and has become a manufacturer; while of the rest only one or two are at present known for their Christian zeal. This, though an extreme case, is an example of what has happened in less conspicuous ways elsewhere, and no doubt will continue to happen in the future. Ordinary Christians also often fail to manifest the clear-cut, decided devotion to their faith which one might expect as the result of their acceptance of a religion so very different from and so much superior to their former beliefs. The attendance at public worship is often unsatisfactory, and the private life of the believers is not always faultless. In the sphere of Christian thought there is a decided tendency toward liberal and rationalistic views, and a disposition to appreciate the ethical more than the dogmatic teachings of the faith. The people are intellectually highly gifted, and when a young man has received the benefit of a superior training in America or Europe he is the equal as a scholar of many of the missionaries, and if his views happen to be extremely liberal, as in many instances has been the case, there is a conflict sometimes in which the missionary is very apt to lose prestige.]

In reference to all these things it is to be said that if the religion of Christ worked magically upon human character, or if the human will were absolutely free, these things would be profoundly disappointing; but as the method of the Divine Spirit is to work through the laws of the human spirit, and men are, therefore, not at once completely turned away from their former mode of life, even though their purpose of heart be new, the trying experiences of Christian work in Japan, though to be deeply regretted, are only the natural results of a situation that has been wrought out by the variety of causes which have been referred to, and for which mainly past generations are responsible.

Having now spoken of the discouragements of the work of missions in Japan, it would be disloyalty to the interests of Christ's Kingdom not to speak also of the encouragements.

The most conspicuous thought about the Empire of the Rising Sun to-day is that it is New Japan. Her awakening from her long sleep and her wonderful progress in the new civilization which she is taking on have challenged the admiration of the Western nations. And what now of this New Japan in relation to missions? My answer is that from the hour that Commodore Perry forced the opening of the country until to-day God has been pointing not only the finger of encouragement, but of special command, toward Japan as a field ripening for the harvest. The new civilization has undoubtedly brought with it minor obstacles to the introduction of Christianity, but taken as a whole the remarkable forward strides of New Japan are throughout a distinct process of preparation for her entrance into the Kingdom of God. It was by a representative of a Christian nation that Japan was opened to the outside world, and the missionary idea was not absent from the very act itself. Commodore Perry sailed up the Bay of Yeddo with an open Bible on the prow of his flagship and singing:

"All people that on earth do dwell!
Sing to the Lord with cheerful voice."

The first treaties were made with the foremost Christian nations, America and England, and the first foreign nation with which Japan came into relations of special friendship was Christian America.

The story of Japan's progress from that time on is too well known to need rehearsal here, and even a glance at her present status may be wearisome. But a reference to the contrast between her condition forty years ago and now is too important for our subject to be omitted. In 1858 Japan was divided up into a large number of feudal estates whose lords were ruled over by a military head of the Empire called Shogun. The Emperor sat in sacred seclusion, shorn of all authority. The people were divided into classes, and, while the highest class had become proud and tyrannical, the lower classes were down-trodden and oppressed. Education received little attention. The useful arts were in a primitive stage of development. What amount of cur-

rent literature existed was generally of a low character. The country had been closed to foreigners, and all the influences from the outside world were the religion, the system of morality and the literature which had been imported from China centuries before.

To-day, what is Japan? She has an Emperor restored to his rightful authority; around him stands a Cabinet of ten Ministers of State, the majority of whom have studied or travelled in Occidental countries. The country is governed according to a constitution, the first one promulgated in Asia. The twenty-eighth article of this fundamental law of the land confers religious freedom. There is in successful operation a Diet consisting of an upper and a lower house, also the first body of its kind in Asia. Many of the gentlemen who sit in these halls of legislation have a personal acquaintance with Western countries. Full corps of diplomatic officials represent the nation at every important foreign capital. By recently revised treaties she is admitted on terms of equality into the community of the great nations of the world, and at this very time is in close sympathy with the greatest Christian nation in the present very important political movements in reference to Korea and China. Her civil, commercial and criminal codes of law have recently been revised and made to conform as far as practicable to the codes of Western nations. She has a standing army of over 200,000 men, equipped and drilled according to the most approved Western methods, and a navy that stands well up in the list of the great navies of the world. An efficient police system serves to make life and property secure and to keep the country in a very fair state of orderliness. A good postal system affords daily mail facilities to every portion of the Empire. The school system, as already implied, is very well organized and enforces the use of its privileges by a compulsory attendance law. A university, taking high rank among the great universities of the world, as well as a large number of colleges, are crowded with young men seeking an education. For a quarter of a century Japan has had young men scattered among the institutions of higher learning in Europe

and America, who have been returning to her as a constant stream ready to mingle the results of their study and observation with the national life. The teaching of the English language in all schools above the primary grade enables thousands of young men all over the land to make direct use of the Western literature that is flowing into the country, and thousands of others have access to it through the numerous translations that have already been made. Spencer and Comte, the favorite foreign writers of a decade ago, have to a large extent been supplanted by Carlyle, Victor Hugo and Tolstoi. The editors of the large number of newspapers and magazines now flooding the country are in many instances readers of Western periodical literature, and the tone of the press has in consequence greatly risen. The light literature also which is pouring forth in such abundance, though still not what it ought to be, has in recent years greatly improved in character. Industries that threaten the West with serious competition have sprung up. Three thousand miles of railroad and thirty thousand miles of telegraph wire are spun over the land and put every corner of the Empire in touch with the pulse-beats of the nation and of the world. Telephones and electric lights are in use. Lighthouses line the coasts. Great steamship lines of her own connect her directly with the world's most important commercial centers. Banks and commercial exchanges figure in the financial and tradal systems. The Gregorian Calendar has been substituted for the Chinese, and there is an official rest day corresponding to the Sunday of Christendom. Hospitals are to be found in every important town. The medical fraternity is intelligent and efficient.

This is the spectacle that this, until recently slumbering, Oriental nation now presents, and a most significant thing about it all is that the adoption of this new civilization is an undoubted success. It is not a process of veneering; it has been an assimilation. Government institutions, military and naval matters, banks, schools, hospitals and factories are carried on with the same composure and success as if they had been here for many years. There are defects yet in the workings that need to be

corrected. Blunders will yet be made that will teach needed wisdom and caution. Disappointments will yet have to be met whose influence will produce a calmer estimate of the future. But no defects can stop the wheels of progress any more, no blunders can deter from forward movements, no disappointments can shake Japan's resolution to reach after the best that is in the world.

That such a phenomenal movement in the history of an ancient nation like Japan is fraught with significance for the nation itself as well as for history at large can not for a moment be questioned. Wherein its weightiest significance lies is less directly, though not less conclusively, evident. The chief significance of the wonderful forward stride of this Oriental nation does not lie in the better ordering of her government, nor in the greater enlightenment of her people, nor in the increase of their comforts and conveniences, though all of these have followed and are important. The chief significance of the advance movement on the part of Japan is her entrance into the family of the great nations, and her consequent subjection to the economic, political, intellectual, moral and spiritual forces that hold sway in this great community. Never before in the history of the world have the great nations been less independent of each other than now. Steam, electricity, financial interests, literature, travel and a host of minor influences have brought them so closely together, and have intertwined their various interests so intricately, that the life of all inevitably flows into each one, and *vice versa*; that the forces dominating the whole must dominate the individual nation, and that the individual necessarily influences the whole. No member of the national community can stand isolated or absolutely control the currents of her own life. For Japan, therefore, to have deliberately and eagerly entered the community of the great powers of the world means that she has subjected herself to influences from which she could not escape if she would. During her past history China and Korea have been her source of influence and inspiration from without; to-day she stands surrounded by the environment of the Christian nations, whose influences are irresistibly penetrating into her life at every pore. And Christianity is not

something apart from the civilization of the great nations of the Occident; it is an integral part of it. Therefore, with these currents from without are coming into Japan Christian ideas, Christian influences and Christian tendencies, entering with such a degree of force as to facilitate beyond measure the process of Christianization.

Turning next to the old religions and the old morality, we find that their influence, though baneful in the extreme in some respects, also contained elements of good. Impressions were made by them upon the human heart which are a preparation and a promise for the acceptance of the true and living faith of Christianity. Shintoism, in its devotion to the one head of the nation, prepared the way for the time when the people of the Japanese nation, no longer able to revere their Emperor as divine, will look higher and adore and worship Him who is the King of kings and the Lord of lords. In its nature-worship it prepared the way for a Christian view of nature as the handiwork of God. Buddhism always contained the idea of the need of deliverance. It was the idea far removed, indeed, from the Christian idea; it implied not deliverance from sin, but deliverance from suffering. But at the same time it developed a sense of need which is one of the most fundamental preparations for the acceptance of Him who is the great Deliverer, who is "alive forevermore," and who has "the keys of death and of hell." Buddhism in its later forms adored Buddha as god and as saviour; through Buddhism, therefore, was cultivated a possibility for faith in Him who is the true and all-sufficient Saviour. By its doctrine of transmigration Buddhism sustained and developed belief in an existence beyond the confines of this earthly life, and thus gave a foregleam of the Christian doctrine of immortality. Buddhism exalted purity of life; and although it was a negative purity that was inculcated, and although the motive was erroneous, the sense of appreciation for purity and virtue of character was certainly enhanced. Buddhism instituted an order, and thus prepared the way for the acceptance of the idea of the Church and of Christian communion. Confucianism cultivated the virtues of patriotism, of obedience

to parents, of faithfulness on the part of the wife to the husband, all of which things are in harmony with the Christian ideal. Moreover, Confucianism cultivated a spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice. Death for his lord was to the warrior the sweetest conclusion of his earthly career. "Our Emperor will honor us," were the last words of two Japanese spies who, after weeks of indescribable torture, were put to death by the Chinese in the recent war. There is scarcely a man, woman or child in Japan who would hesitate to die for the sake of the country. Thus have the people in whose bosoms course such feelings been unconsciously prepared to make the sacrifices required by Him who said: "Whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it." Nor was the spirit of sacrifice inculcated always sacrifice for a superior. One of the favorite incidents of Japanese history is the story of Sakura Sogora, who deliberately surrendered his life to obtain relief for his sorely oppressed neighbors; and Japanese admiration for the spirit here displayed makes it easy for them to look with reverence upon Him "who gave his life a ransom" for all. To Confucianism, again, is due a keen appreciation of the moral as the moral is regarded by this ancient code. Character, as character is judged, is highly prized. There are young men's societies in Japan whose avowed and sole object is not sociability, not the cultivation of the mind, but mutual help in the attainment of good character; they are morality societies, pure and simple. The presence of these benign footprints left upon the hearts and lives of this ancient people must be thankfully and reverently recognized by the missionary. It is evidence to him that even this portion of the human family has not been left entirely alone, but that these ancient systems of religion and morality have been used to some degree toward the fulfillment of the divine purposes of love in the world.

Thirdly, there is encouragement in the natural traits of the people. These natural traits after all constitute the soil in which the new faith must ultimately root itself. We find the people of Japan an intensely nationalistic people, a self-assertive people, a self-confident people. These qualities have run into faults, but

they may also, under the sanctifying power of a new life, become forceful for good. The complaint of the missionaries in Japan is that extreme self-confidence on the part of the people, which would lead some of them to dispense with missionary aid in matters of religion, and to believe that in no department of national progress is the presence of the foreigner any longer necessary. In India the complaint is of the opposite character; there the natives manifest no disposition to stand upon their own feet. Between these two kinds of difficulty the latter is to be regarded as the more serious. The former is more troublesome, more trying to the life of the missionary worker; but it also furnishes a basis for a vigorous church life such as does not exist in the other case. Just as the Buddhism of Japan has been stronger than that of southern Asia, so will it also, in all probability, be in the case of Christianity. Again, the Japanese are intellectually, morally and spiritually a well-endowed people. In the American and European institutions of higher learning in which Japanese have studied they have held their own with their Occidental fellow students. The Japanese mind is keen; it is capable of fine distinctions, as well as of deep thought and comprehensive views. It may lack in patience and perseverance, though even here there are many examples to the contrary. The Japanese appreciation of the moral has already been referred to as a product of Confucianism; there must have been a basis for it in Japanese character, however; otherwise it could never have attained to the strength it came to possess in Japan. The features of reverence for superiors and readiness for sacrifice have already been spoken of. To them need to be added gentleness, courtesy and kindness. As for the spiritual nature of the Japanese, the highest testimony to its existence and depth is the exalted form which Buddhism took in Japan. That so close an approach to theism was made by the Jodo and the Shin sects, and that the doctrine of salvation by faith alone should be the fundamental tenet of the most powerful of all the sects in the country, is strong evidence that the Japanese are naturally not only not unspiritual, but that they stand among the best spiritually-endowed of non-Christian

peoples. Not as mystical are they, indeed, as the people of India, but after all possibly nearer the ideal of the true Christian mind.

Taking under review now these several points of encouragement, namely, the preparation that is going forward through the introduction of Western civilization, the elements of helpfulness in the old religions, and the favorable traits of the native character, it is possible to understand how, in spite of the discouraging circumstances spoken of in the first part of this article, the progress of missions has, after all, been so rapid. For the work in Japan thus far has been among the most rapid in missionary history. It is also possible to see how Christian ideas could penetrate far beyond the confines of direct missionary work. There is not a community in the Empire, it is safe to say, that is the same as it would be without the presence of Christianity in the land. Even the language of Buddhist and Shinto discourses is modified by Christian forms of expression. The recent war between Japan and China was conducted on the most humane principles of modern warfare. In the year 1896, when a great tidal wave broke over the northeast coast of Japan, as fast as conveyances could carry them, physicians and nurses of the Red Cross Society were upon the ground, alleviating the distress of the wounded and the dying, and a quarter of a million dollars flowed in, an unheard-of manifestation of a spirit of benevolence. These things are the result of the combined influence of missionary work and of contact with Christian nations.

As to the future, the encouraging circumstances that have been spoken of amount to a loud call for earnest and courageous work in this land of the Rising Sun. The hand of Providence has not been absent from the waking-up of this Oriental nation. It was not chance that guided her so peculiarly during the past forty years. It was not man's choice alone that led her so near the foot of the Cross. Yea, the hand of Providence was not absent from her in her past history, when she yet felt her way along amid the struggles of barbarism, or when she groped after God through Shintoism and Buddhism; much less has that

guidance been lacking in her recent remarkable history. And if Providence has led this nation into the very circle of the Christian nations, into the very outer court of the temple of the living God, does not the duty of Christian missions assume tremendous importance in reference to her? Does not the Great Commission, "Go ye and teach all nations," come with a startling newness of force? Such devoted men of God as Williams, Verbeck and Hepburn, already in 1859, heard the newness of the call and hastened to the field and accomplished a work of undying significance. But the call is louder to-day than it was then. The greatness of the opportunity and the responsibility have risen up before us like a phantom. Let, therefore, the Church heed the call. Let her form larger conceptions of the work. Let her have faith and courage to go forward, and a great victory will be in store for her.

VII.

THE LIFE OF DR. PHILIP SCHAFF.*

BY THEODORE APPEL, D.D.

The Life of Dr. Schaff may be divided into three parts, the period spent in Switzerland, in Germany and in America, the last constituting its full expansion, here in this land of freedom.

IN SWITZERLAND.

He was born January 1, 1819, at Chur, in the Canton Grisons, or Graubünden as it is also called, a little republic in the eastern part of the Schweiz, the largest in area, but not in population, mostly Protestant. From its Alpine heights, the Rhine flows towards the north, whilst other streams flow southward, emptying into the Po in Italy. The fresh, bracing air of these highlands had a beneficial effect upon young Philip Schaff's physical constitution; the republican institutions were educational; the primary schools were in good order; and the pastor was a truly religious and evangelical man; but a mother's influence made the deepest impression on the son. His father died when he was only one year old, and the mother took charge of him as her only son, and trained him only as a true and noble mother could train her child. In after years he said "she was a woman of a strong constitution, a good mind, an independent will and native humor." Soon after his arrival at Mercersburg she sent him a letter full of affection and maternal advice. Upon hearing it read, Dr. Nevin remarked that it indicated that "she was a woman of superior intelligence."

The Doctor himself says, "I was born in poverty and obscurity, and I can truly say that by the grace of God I am what I am."

*The Life of Philip Schaff, in part Autobiographical, by David S. Schaff, Professor of Church History in Lane Theological Seminary, with Portraits. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 526, 1897.

He made rapid progress in the lower and higher schools at Chur, saw many people passing through the town for the purpose of traffic or travel, and made friends wherever he went. His pastor, Antistes Kind, noticed him and by his advice he was sent to Kornthal, Würtemberg, walking the whole distance with his sole possessions in a knapsack. He was then fifteen years old.

IN GERMANY.

Kornthal was a neat, quiet little village, seven miles from Stuttgart, where an academy had been founded by religious people, somewhat on the Moravian order, where they wished to send their boys to be educated, so that they might be free from the contaminating influence of the prevailing indifferentism and rationalism of the State Church. Young Schaff was now in a section of Germany which had given birth to many of the most distinguished scholars and writers of modern times; Schiller, Uhland, Wieland, Knapp, Schelling, Hegel, Kepler, Bengel, Storr, Schmid, Dörner, Paulus, Baur, Strauss, and others. All these were natives of the little kingdom of Würtemberg, and it was highly important that young Schaff should be prepared in his early days to encounter the divergent systems of thought around him, some of them very bad, wherever he might meet with them. This was happily accomplished in an important sense during his stay of eight months at Kornthal—a matter of momentous consequence in his subsequent life. There he passed through a deep, religious experience, as he tells us. He had been engrafted into the Christian Church at Chur, according to the rite of the Reformed Church, and now at Kornthal he was confirmed by Praelat Kapff, according to the Lutheran rite.

From Kornthal he passed over to Stuttgart to attend the gymnasium, where he remained until 1837, where he was prepared for his course at the university. Here he spent part of his time in the family of Mr. Mann, a wealthy merchant, who was held in high esteem for his wisdom and piety. There he made himself useful by teaching some of his children, among whom was William Julius Mann, who afterwards followed Dr. Schaff to Amer-

ica, and subsequently held a high position among the divines of the Lutheran Church.

The time, in 1837, had now arrived that he should enter upon his studies in the university. But where were the means for his support during the three years' course? Providence was to provide for him. He had friends who were willing to extend to him loans or gifts as they were needed. He went to the University of Tübingen and remained there two years. His instructors were among the ablest men in Germany, but the theological faculty were divided into two opposite camps. Dr. Baur, an intense rationalist, was then representing the negative critical school. He made sad havoc with the literature of the New Testament, and according to Ewald, his colleague, he was "no Christian at all, worse than a heathen or only a common literary Jew." He possessed vast stores of learning, and Dr. Schaff says that next to Neander he was the most influential teacher in Germany. But it was all for nought. Strauss, his disciple, in his "Life of Jesus," carried out his principles of biblical criticism to their legitimate conclusion, and reduced him to a *reductio ad absurdum*. But there were other teachers at Tübingen, faithful and true to the Gospel, and Schaff, who had previously received a truly evangelical training, could not be led astray by any false teacher or Gamaliel. Dorner lectured for a part of his time in the school. Bengel had once been a professor there, not as yet forgotten, and Schmid, on the side of the orthodox faith, was reading his voluminous lectures, to which Philip Schaff listened with patient attention. Fortunately he transcribed each one of them, as unfortunately they never appeared in print. During this period, as a candidate for the ministry, encouraged by Knapp and Mrs. Meta Von Heusser, his poetic friend in Switzerland, he preached in sundry places, in villages roundabout, always walking the whole distance to fill his appointments. This helped to develop his oratorical talents.

The third and last year of his university studies was spent at Halle and Berlin. Here he listened to such teachers as Tholuck, Julius Müller, Neander and Hengstenberg; and during short visits

he shook hands and conversed with other theological giants such as Nitzsch, Rothe, Ullman, Umbreit, Dorner, Lange, Ebrard and others. He was now in a different atmosphere from that in which he had been living in Würtemberg, old Suabia, which was dim and misty, and it was truly refreshing and spiritually healthy. At Halle, Professor Tholuck took him into his house and employed him as his amanuensis. With other students he went out with them now and then for a walk, and talked with them on the subject of religion and other topics as they went along. He treated Schaff like a brother. Drs. Park, Robinson, H. B. Smith, Prentiss and Hodge were often in such parties.

Dr. and Mrs. Tholuck accompanied Schaff to Berlin, and there introduced him to the best society. Hengstenberg's mother-in-law introduced him to Baroness von Kröcher, a widow, who had lost all her children except one, little Heinrich, aged 15, and she employed him as his tutor. She treated him with the affection of a mother, gave him a liberal salary, and left him have ample time to attend the lectures in the university. He remained two years in her service, spending the winter in Berlin and the summer in her castle at Cöthen, a most beautiful spot, not far out from Berlin. When he left her service she offered him a gift of money, which he said amounted to as much as a year's salary at Mercersburg, which, however, he respectfully declined to receive.

After his life in the universities came to an end in 1841, the Baroness engaged him as her travelling companion over the southern part of Europe, in charge of her son. The trip lasted fourteen months. They visited all the celebrated cities of Italy in the north and the south. They spent a whole week in the city of Rome, where travellers often had to wait three hours before their time came to be introduced to Pope Gregory XVI., which some of them thought was only so much time lost. Crossing the Alps the party passed over to Switzerland, where young Schaff greeted his life-long friends, Merle d' Aubigne, Malan, Gaussen, Pilet and Herzog.

On his return to Berlin in the fall of 1842, he began to lecture

in the University as Privat Docent, under the impression that he had a call to be a teacher of theology, in which he was supported and so advised by his teachers. He had published his trial essays for the right to lecture in two brochures, the one on "James, the Lord's Brother," the other on the "Sin Against the Holy Ghost," which arrested attention, especially the latter. The road, however, leading to a professorship in a German university is arduous and candidates have to wait, sometimes a long time, and such was the prospect of Philip Schaff. Here we may be permitted to remark parenthetically, that his original name was Schaf, but in accordance with the advice of his learned friends in Germany, he added another letter to it. The former carried with it associations of a shepherd's life, whilst the latter designated one who was a *worker*, something characteristic of Germans who are hard workers, whether learned or unlearned.

But this Privat Docent did not have to wait long for his appointment to a full professorship. In 1843 Dr. Hoffeditz and Dr. Schneck appeared in Germany, with a call to Dr. Krummacher from the Synod of the Reformed Church to become the successor of Dr. Rauch as German Professor in the Seminary at Mercersburg. For sufficient reasons the great pulpit orator declined to accept the call, and then their attention was directed to Docent Schaff with a singular degree of unanimity by prominent theologians, such as Neander, Tholuck, Hengstenberg and others of their school. They thought that his going to America would be a loss to Germany, as one of them remarked, "*Der Nachwuchs von grossen Männern ist immer klein.*" Great men have their day and then pass away without able successors. Schaff had a number of distinctive qualifications for the new situation in America: he was a fluent speaker, an eloquent preacher, a Swiss Republican, an industrious worker in whatever he undertook, and as yet youthful, so that he could be the more readily acclimated in a new country. He was just the right man to be sent on this mission—selected by Providence. Returning to America Dr. Schneck found the Synod in session at Winchester, Va., in October, 1843. The admirable testimony of the distin-

guished theologians were read in its hearing, and copies of Mr. Schaff's work on the "Sin Against the Holy Ghost" were distributed among the members. And, accordingly, by a unanimous vote he was called to fill the Chair of Church History and Biblical Literature in the Seminary at Mercersburg.

His ordination to the ministry and his future work in America took place in Dr. Krummacher's large church at Elberfeld, under the auspices of the Wupperthal Missionary Society, in the presence of an immense audience. Addresses were delivered, prayers offered up, and the services were of an exceedingly impressive character. "How shall we not feel ourselves constrained," cried out one of the speakers, "to extend our sympathy to our German brethren in America by reaching forth a helping hand in favor of their religious institutions, and by carrying our earnest supplications before the throne of grace for their prosperity." Dr. Schaff preached the sermon, and took for his text Paul's vision of the man in Asia, who said, Come over into Macedonia and help us. The German churches in America, he said, were threatened with paganism, Romanism and sectarianism. The whole scene at Elberfeld reminds us somewhat of the commission of Saul and Barnabas at Antioch to preach the gospel among the Gentiles.

On his way to America Dr. Schaff remained in England six weeks, where he was a close observer of men and things. He found that he was in a different country from that of Germany, but he soon familiarized himself with the different phases of English life and thought, most of which were new to him. The May Anniversaries were in progress at Exeter Hall and he was surprised to see the interest taken by the people in missions and other practical questions among the different Nonconformist denominations, such as the Congregationalists, Wesleyans and Baptists. He attended the services of the Church of England and listened to the Liturgy with much satisfaction, but the sermons were not as good, as heart-stirring, as in the Dissenting congregations.

Through letters of introduction he became acquainted with a

number of leading men in England. He met the Archbishop of Canterbury, called on Dr. Jelf, Sir Thomas Ackland, Sir Robert Inglis, Principal of King's College, Maurice and even Thomas Carlyle, "who had an interesting face, but seemed to have a good opinion of himself." He visited the House of Parliament, and saw some of the great leaders in the political world, Sir Robert Peel, Wellington, Brougham and Russel, and heard Daniel O'Connell deliver a thrilling speech on the anti-slavery question. The ten days he spent in Oxford, he says, were of the most interesting character, where at the time the Tractarian movement was the engrossing topic of discussion. He had an interview with Dr. Pusey, who was turning his eyes back to the first six centuries of the Christian era, quite at home with Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian and Augustine. The decrees of the Councils were the rule of his thinking. The Ancient Church, he maintained, was the venerable mother to whom we must yield unquestioning obedience. The cause of the pitiable state of affairs in America was to be found in the renunciation of the doctrine of Apostolic succession. Schaff listened, then asked whether the Scripture did not teach that bishops and presbyters were the same officers in the Apostolic Church. That was not so evident to Pusey, and so he said that where anything cannot be proved from Scripture, there the Church was final to him, and we may rest with confidence upon it. "Why," he asked, "could not the Reformers have applied to the Church of England for ordination?" The Reformers were not his pets. Schaff asked, "why we should remain in the child period? Does not the Church represent the continuance of the life of Christ, and must she not go on *developing* to the full maturity of Christ's life? Did not the Lord promise to be with His Church to the end of the world?" All that does not touch the doctrine of the Church, was Pusey's reply. The two doctors then shook hands, and like two good brethren wished each other a safe journey in life, the one going forward, and the other backward.

IN AMERICA.

Dr. Schaff arrived in New York, July 28, 1844, after a safe voyage of five weeks, where Dr. B. C. Wolff, of Easton, was deputed to welcome the new professor on his arrival. At Harrisburg the Triennial Convention of the two Reformed Churches was holding its sessions, where he met a number of prominent clergymen, and among the rest Dr. Nevin, his future colleague. At Chambersburg a deputation of students from the Seminary received him and escorted him to Mercersburg on the twelfth of August. Many of our readers are familiar with the reception at Mercersburg in the evening: the procession of students from Prospect Hill, or Schoene Aussicht, through the principal street up to the Seminary, under the triumphal arch at the gate, the addresses under the cupola, the illumination of the building and the music of the band up in the cupola, but space will not allow us to go into particulars, and we can therefore only refer to the reports in the "Messenger" and "College Recollections." This was another great surprise.

The first thing that engaged the attention of the professor-elect was to prepare his inaugural address. He conferred with Dr. Schneek in regard to a proper subject, and he told him that it should be "Protestantism"; and for such a selection he very probably had his reasons. For some time previous to this Dr. Nevin was in ill odor among certain divines in Philadelphia, who taught that the Catholic Church was the synagogue of Satan, and the Papacy the harlot clothed in scarlet. To all this Dr. Nevin demurred, and when asked to define his position by his students he said that the Church of Rome, corrupt in some or many respects, in doctrine and practice, was nevertheless *a branch* of the Church of Christ. This, of course, was not satisfactory to the circle in Philadelphia, and for the first time the Seminary was charged with a Romanizing tendency, and to correct this impression, most likely, Dr. Schaff was advised to take Protestantism as the theme of his address.

The Reformed Synod at an adjourned meeting in October, 1844, at Reading, received Dr. Schaff from the Evangelical

Church in Germany upon his reception of the Heidelberg Catechism as the basis of his faith, and he then proceeded to deliver his address on the "Principle of Protestantism." As a matter of course, he could not deliver the whole of it at one time—probably the longest of the kind ever delivered in this country. It was then revised and still further enlarged, when it was published, first in German and then in English, early in 1845. The English translation contained a commendatory Introduction by Dr. Nevin and his sermon on Catholic Unity, delivered at the Triennial Convention at Harrisburg. Both editions contained the one hundred and twelve Theses annexed to the address, which embraced in a few words the theology of the Protestant or Evangelical Church. Want of space will not allow us to speak of the contents of the address. Many of our leaders are familiar with what it said. Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, commended it, and so did Dr. Taylor Lewis, of the Dutch Reformed Church; but this was not the case with the Anti-Catholic divines of whom Dr. J. F. Berg, of Philadelphia, was the leader and spokesman, who sounded the first notes of alarm, and the Rev. Jacob Helfenstein, of Germantown, responded. The Classis of Philadelphia took matters into its own hands, adopted a creed of its own, declaring that "the Papal System was the mystery of iniquity, the great apostasy and the mother of abominations on the earth." The attention of Synod was then directed to the Principle of Protestantism, as contravening the true doctrine of the Church, or rather the faith of Classis as affirmed in its resolutions. This declaration or action of the Classis produced considerable excitement throughout the Church.

The Synod met at York in October, 1845, and what has been called Dr. Schaff's trial for heresy at that meeting forms an interesting chapter of church history among the Reformed.

The proceedings of the Classis were pronounced out of order by the Synod, as charges against a professor should first be brought before the Board of Visitors; but the Synod waived this informality, and referred the book to a committee of which Dr. B. C. Wolff was the chairman, which reported that they had ex-

amined it carefully, and that they had not found anything censurable in it; on the contrary, they commended it. Here the matter might have ended, but at the request of both professors, an opportunity was extended to all alike to engage in a free discussion of the contents of the Inaugural. Thereupon the great debate began, which lasted several days, and large crowds came to the church to hear it. Dr. Berg was an eloquent speaker, and he concluded his address by quoting Luther's last words at the Diet of Worms. Dr. Nevin made a calm, logical speech, and Dr. Schaff made two speeches on different days, mostly in German, but partly in English; and when he could not think of the right word in English he was assisted by some one on his right or left. When the Synod came to vote Dr. Wolff's report was adopted almost unanimously, thirty-seven voting in its favor; only three voting against it, two elders and Dr. Berg.

The public pronouncement of the Synod of York had a happy effect upon the minds of the professors. It served as an inspiration or impulse, full of encouragement, to go forward and to make advances in the development of theological and religious thinking. They were joint laborers in the same field. Dr. Nevin was in full sympathy with Dr. Schaff, and a strong support to him, as yet a stranger, in commencing his great work in this country. Dr. Schaff, on the other hand, was of much service to Dr. Nevin in supplying him with valuable German literature, and in giving him a clear understanding of the weakness and strength of German theology. They did not differ in any vital points. Dr. Nevin was a powerful writer, a deep thinker, and he clothed Dr. Schaff's thoughts as well as his own in a clear, vigorous, English style of writing. See Dr. Schaff's estimate of his colleague in the "*Life of Dr. Nevin.*" In 1846 Dr. Nevin published the "*Mystical Presence in the Lord's Supper,*" a remarkable work, in harmony with what had been taught on the Reformed side of the Reformation. It may be regarded as a supplement to the "*Principle of Protestantism.*" Dr. Nevin was not Dr. Schaff, nor was Dr. Schaff Dr. Nevin, but they were sympathetic. Dr. Nevin's contribution was not a very large volume,

but it contained a vast amount of learning and deep thought. It made an impression in its day, and it will still be found to be a valuable *vade mecum* to thoughtful readers in our day.

When Dr. Schaff started for America he was not certain that it would become his permanent home. Possibly in the course of a few years, he might wish to return to the Fatherland. But in December, 1845, he was married to Miss Mary Elizabeth Schleigh, of Frederick, Md., a lady well qualified to make him a true and faithful helpmeet. That settled the question. At the same time he became naturalized, and in the exuberance of his joy in becoming an American citizen, he said that he had forsworn allegiance to all foreign potentates.

Thus happily located he began his long and arduous work in the New World. He made no use of text-books, but prepared lectures of his own with much care for the benefit of his students, for four years in the German language. Already in 1846 he delivered a public address on "Anglo-Germanism," a thought which Dr. Rauch had already sought to carry out. The address was translated into English and published. About the same time Dr. Nevin translated his tract on "What is Church History?" in defence of the theory of an organic and progressive development in the life of the Church. The *Deutsche Kirchenfreund* founded in 1848, intended for the German churches, Lutheran and Reformed, appeared as a monthly under Dr. Schaff's editorship for six years. It helped to bind the two sister churches together more closely in the bond of Christian charity. His "History of the Apostolic Church," was published first in German at Mercersburg in 1851, for which, as in the case of the "Monthly," the author had to purchase a special font of type and to import a German compositor, whilst he sometimes had to help his typo with his own hands. This work was translated into English by the Rev. Edward O. Yeomans in 1853, and in this form it made a very favorable impression in different theological circles. Dr. J. Addison Alexander in the *Princeton Review* said "it placed the author in the highest rank of living and contemporary authors." Dr. Hodge, Dr. Bacon, the *Edinburgh Review*, Dean Alford,

Ullman, Bunsen and others wrote in regard to its merits in similar terms of commendation. A few others, however, on the left wing made serious charges against the new book, prominently a professor of Latin at New Brunswick. This was the first volume and most probably the best, of a series of volumes on "Church History."

A short time after Dr. Schaff's arrival in this country he found that little or no account was made of the church festivals at Mercersburg. He, therefore, held an enthusiastic service in the Seminary Chapel on Good Friday, and gave a new impulse to the proper observance of such days, which were losing their significance and usefulness in the churches.

In 1850 Dr. Nevin resigned his professorship in the Seminary on account of ill health, and after that Dr. Schaff was the sole professor in the institution for four years; but as his health seemed to be suffering also, the Synod allowed him leave of absence for one year "in view of the arduous labors he had been rendering to the Church." Late in the autumn of 1853, therefore, he sailed for Europe. Arriving at Liverpool, he first went up to Scotland, where he found that the spirit of John Calvin was still living. Proceeding southward he was a guest in Archbishop Wilberforce's Episcopal mansion in England, where he sat in the chair of his father, William Wilberforce, the great anti-slavery champion; he saw Pusey again at Oxford, still fixed in his opinions; dined with Baron Bunsen in London, who entertained him until midnight reading large portions of one of his works; attended the Catholic Cathedral on Sunday forenoon; in the afternoon he went to Westminster Abbey, where everybody could understand the fine liturgical service, and in the evening he heard a sermon from Dr. Cumming in the Scotch Presbyterian Church against all Unitarians. Next morning he breakfasted with Maurice, where he met Archdeacon Hare and Trench; in the evening he attended a brilliant reception at Baron Bunsen's, where he met Sir John Herschel, Professor Lepsius, Max Müller, Dean Mitman, Stanley and others, and on the last day of his visit he breakfasted with Bunsen.

From what has been said above it will appear that Dr. Schaff was an industrious traveller, and that he always found that he was welcome in the best society in England. The same remark may be made in regard to his tour on the continent: from London to Paris, Elberfeld, Halle, Leipsic, Berlin, Vienna, Venice, Trent, Innsbruck, Switzerland, Chur, Basel, Zurich, Bern and Stuttgart. Whilst in Berlin he was invited to deliver some lectures on America, and he had for his audiences the culture of the city. The lectures appeared in a neat little volume under the title "Amerika," published at Berlin. At Zurich there was some talk of getting Schaff to fill Lange's place in the University, but he did not encourage such a thought.

In 1852 Dr. Bernard C. Wolff was elected to fill the place of Dr. Nevin in the Seminary, but he did not enter upon his duties until 1854; and when Dr. Schaff returned from Europe, he found that he had a colleague, who by his age, and experience, was a wise counsellor as well as able instructor in imparting instruction in the School of the Prophets. Their relations throughout were pleasant, and helped to relieve Dr. Schaff of a feeling of isolation when Marshall College was removed to Lancaster in 1853.

The movement in favor of a new Liturgy was to some extent spontaneous in the Church, and it was stimulated by the churchly tendency of the professors at Mercersburg, but it was manifestly under Providential direction. The Synod of 1849 appointed a committee to take the matter in hand, of which Dr. Nevin was Chairman, who wrote some able, urgent articles on the subject, but under the impression that the work might lead to discord or trouble in the Church, or that the time had not as yet arrived for such a new departure, he withdrew from the Chairmanship, and Dr. Schaff was substituted in his place.

Dr. Schaff was in all respects well qualified for this position. The Liturgical Question had engaged his attention in Germany, where a new liturgy had been prepared for the Evangelical Church under the direction of the King of Prussia, which had produced a wide sensation. It helped to give Dr. Schaff a proper idea of

what a true liturgical service should include. He therefore engaged in the enterprise with no small amount of activity and energy. He held frequent meetings of the committee from 1851 onwards; at first the progress was slow, but in 1857 they had prepared and published a "Provisional Liturgy" for examination or optional use in the Church. It obtained an extensive circulation and a third edition was called for in 1858. It was, however, only tentative, and the Committee thought it should be revised, and might be improved. The General Synod, in 1863, accordingly requested the Eastern Synod to direct the committee to go forward with the work of revision. The result was the publication of the "Order of Worship" in 1866, which allowed the churches to use liturgical forms when they wished to do so, or free prayer if that was the preference. Dr. Schaff thus deserved much credit for his services in supplying the Reformed Church with a suitable Liturgy, which compares favorably with that of the Church of England, or that of the Evangelical Church of Germany after which it was modelled.

During the Civil War Mercersburg was not a congenial place for study. *Inter arma, silent musæ.* Schaff spent the winter of 1862-1863, at Andover, supplying the chair of Church History, made vacant by the removal of Professor Sheadd to New York. In January, 1863, the Reformed Church celebrated the Tricentennial Anniversary of the Heidelberg Catechism in Philadelphia. Dr. Schaff was among the first to propose this memorial festival, as early as 1859, and largely through his mediation such distinguished theologians as Herzog, Hundeshagen, Ebrard and Ullman consented to prepare learned papers for the occasion. The proceedings of the convention, including all the papers read, were published in English, and a German translation by Professor Schaff during the same year.

In the autumn of 1863, he obtained leave of absence from the Seminary for two years; and in 1864, at the urgent entreaty of the New York Sabbath Committee, he was induced to become its secretary. He entered upon this work with his usual energy, and he remained in charge of it, as its executive officer, for five years.

He established centers of coöperation in other large cities as Baltimore, Philadelphia and Chicago, delivered many addresses, wrote articles for the papers, and published an interesting book on the observance of the Sabbath, not exactly in accord with the traditional rigor of the old Puritan Sabbath, but as a day of rest worship, in accordance with the law of the country and of the Holy Bible, in opposition to what is sometimes called the Continental Sabbath.

In 1865 he went as the accredited representative of the Committee to Germany, and his voice in favor of a stricter church life and a stricter observance of the Lord's Day was heard, as we are told, "from Elberfeld to Basel, and from Bremen to Chur, his native place in Switzerland." His appeals met with a hearty response from many Evangelical ministers in Germany, and Sunday-schools, bible classes and prayer-meetings were established where they did not previously exist. Thus Germany sent its learning and scholarship to America, and America in return sent back practical religion to the Fatherland, something which was very much needed at that time.

In 1870 Dr. Schaff accepted the professorship of Theological Encyclopedia and Christian Symbolism in Union Seminary, New York, and subsequently he filled the chair of Church History, which position he held until his resignation in 1893. His activity in other directions on the outside did not interfere materially with his duties in the Seminary. He prepared his lectures for the students with much care, and they supplied him with the material, already at hand, for the publication of many of his books, especially his volumes on Church History. He then left the Reformed and entered the Presbyterian Church. The former had taken Dr. Nevin from the latter, but in return she gave Dr. Schaff to her sister. This, however, was only one case of reciprocity between the two denominations.

When measures were adopted in England to secure a revision of our English Bible in 1870, Dr. Schaff was authorized to establish an American Committee to coöperate with the one in England. But it soon leaked out that the Committee in America

was to be subordinate to the one in England, something which could not be allowed: it was contrary to the feelings of American scholars, and most of them were in favor of preparing an independent American Revision. Dr. Schaff, however, seeing the difficulty, went to England and discussed the matter with the English brethren. He told them plainly and emphatically that his branch must be allowed to coöperate with the British Committee on terms of fraternal equality, and have co-equal rights in the final determination of the text: otherwise they would publish an American Revision of their own. This was plain language, and the ultimatum was granted.

Dr. Schaff was much interested in the Evangelical Alliance from the time it was organized in London in 1846, and when it established one of its branches in New York he took an active part in promoting its interests. As its commissioner, on a visit to Europe, he awakened much interest in the Conference which was to be held in New York in 1873, on the Continent as well as in England and Scotland. His mission was successful beyond expectation, very gratifying in view of the great aversion of Continental, especially German scholars, to venturing out on the ocean and crossing it. The presence of so many distinguished foreign scholars in New York, including such men as Dörner, Christlieb, Krafft and others, made a happy impression. Never before had such an array of scholars, clergymen and eminent Christians been brought together at an ecclesiastical council in this country.

Dr. Schaff delivered an address at the meeting of the Alliance at Florence, Italy, on the "Renaissance and the Reformation," very able, judicious and conciliatory; and, although in a Catholic country, it was received with great applause, and called forth a spontaneous vote of thanks. After his trip through Bible lands on his way back to America, he attended the first Council of the Reformed Churches in Edinburgh, commonly called the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance. He was there invited to read the first paper, the subject of which was "The Harmony of the Reformed Churches." Dr. Blaikie had previously written to him that "his consensus paper would do great service by bringing out the great doctrines

of grace as the foundation of Reformed Christendom. On your paper everything will depend. God grant it may give us a noble start." The paper said that "Modern theology is not solifidian, nor predestinarian, nor sacramentarian, but Christological. The central doctrine about which all others revolve is the great mystery of God manifest in the flesh, the divine-human personality and the atoning work of our Lord." The address concluded with a fervent appeal for Christian unity upon the basis of a personal union with Christ. The council began well and came to a happy conclusion. Through Schaff's influence distinguished scholars of the Reformed churches on the Continent were secured to take part in this convention, and this helped to give it a more ecumenical character. Through his extensive acquaintance with theologians in many places, he was best qualified to name the proper persons as representatives. He attended other meetings of the Council, at Belfast and London, and his presence at these meetings always seemed to have an inspiring influence.

In his day he and his family suffered some very severe afflictions. Five out of eight of his children preceded him to their heavenly home. The death of Meta, his beloved daughter, a refined young lady, was painful in the extreme. At first he knew not what to do with himself, so much was he broken down in spirit. This affliction, however, became the immediate occasion of his visit to the Orient with Mrs. Schaff. Passing over to Paris and Neuchâtel, and making some arrangements for the Evangelical Alliance, he started for Italy, and thence he sailed for Alexandria. Having seen the wonders of Egypt, having attended a meeting for the organization of an Egyptian branch of the Evangelical Alliance at Cairo, and having sailed up the Nile, he placed Mrs. Schaff with some of his friends on a steamer for Jaffa. He then turned his face towards Mt. Sinai. The journey through the wilderness over the hot sand, with occasional sand storms, through intense heat, with growling camels and vile insects, was a weariness to the flesh, from the beginning to the end. He seemed to have some ambition to stand where Moses stood. With Dean Stanley he was fully satisfied that a certain mountain peak, Ras Susafeh, was the place

where Moses received the Law. In ascending the granite flanks he did some of the hardest climbing in his lifetime. "If ever there was a poetic fitness," he says, "between an event and its environs we have it here. This Sinai group stands in awful silence in the midst of death and desolation, reflecting the majesty and terrible holiness of Jehovah, and it is the fittest pulpit for the Law, which threatens death and damnation." The experience in this wilderness confirmed Dr. Schaff's conviction of the truth of the Mosaic records, and he used to say that, if certain sceptics had taken this journey, instead of sitting in cosy rooms with their pens in hand to promulgate their doubts, they would have no doubt to promulgate.

From Sinai the doctor went on his way to Jerusalem, with Mrs. Schaff, visited Bethlehem, the Jordan, Nazareth, Baalbec, Athens and other cities in Europe and arrived safely in America in August, 1877. He recorded his observations in a handsome volume, "*Through Bible Lands*," one of his most popular books, full of interesting reading for all classes of readers.

During this period there was a widespread feeling in the Presbyterian Church that there ought to be a revision of the Westminster Confession of Faith. An overture to the Presbyteries from the General Assembly on the subject received an affirmative reply from a large majority. Dr. Schaff, as a matter of course, entered into this movement with his usual spirit and hopefulness, and sent forth a pamphlet, with several articles in different papers, in its advocacy. The statements of the Confession in regard to predestination, reprobation, preterition, and the possible damnation of non-elect infants, were too strong, and they must be modified or omitted altogether. There was to be an omission as well as a revision. The discussion, however, ceased abruptly when a nervous agitation arose in regard to the orthodoxy of Dr. Charles A. Briggs, Professor of Biblical Theology in Union Seminary. The discussion produced an intense excitement throughout the Church, and it was thought it might end in another division as had been the case in 1837; but it ended, apparently, at least, in the suspension of Dr. Briggs from the ministry, and

of Professor Smith, of Lane Seminary one year afterwards. The effect of this whirl of excitement upon Dr. Schaff's mind and physical strength was very injurious. It was too much of a strain. He had some apprehension that he, too, might be called up for trial, but this was not the case. He was in sympathy with Dr. Briggs, had seen him while he was studying theology in a three years' course at the University of Berlin, and had afterward recommended him as a proper person to fill a chair as a professor in Union Seminary. Dr. Briggs, according to Dr. Schaff, had erred in the use of some offensive language in a public address. "If he had had," he said, "*the suaviter in modo as well as the fortiter in re*, he would not have offended so many persons, except inveterate old fogies in theology, who believe in the infallibility of John Calvin and the Westminster divines." Schaff, now an American, was still a staunch defender of the German *Lehrfreiheit*, under proper limitations.

It was not strange that his health broke down under the stress of his numerous and continuous labors for so many years. In the summer of 1892, while trying to recuperate his strength at Lake Mohonk, N. Y., his usual summer resting place with his family, he fell down helpless and speechless from an attack of paralysis. He, however, soon rallied, and being invited by a friend, he came to Lancaster with Mrs. Schaff to attend a meeting of the Reformed Synod in October. It was thought he would not travel that far, but he came; he was presented to the Synod and was most affectionately received. During this visit he requested a prominent physician, Dr. M. L. Herr, to examine his physical condition, who, after a critical examination, made a favorable report; but he told him he ought to abate all literary work for a while at least.

After this visit he returned to New York and during the winter he omitted his lectures to his students. In the spring following he resigned his professorship in Union Seminary, and his health seemed to be improving. In the month of May he attended the sessions of the General Assembly at Washington, D. C., as a private listener, during the entire meeting of that ex-

citing assembly of ministers and elders, when judgment was pronounced against Dr. Briggs. From Washington he went to Reading where the Reformed Synod was celebrating the Centennial of its organization. Here he delivered an address on "Switzerland," which was his valedictory to his Reformed brethren.

Later in the summer he visited Chicago, where he had been invited to deliver an address at the Parliament of Religions. He prepared a paper on "The Reunion of Christendom." He said, "I was warned by physicians and friends not to go to Chicago. They said it might kill me. But I was determined to bear my last testimony to the cause of Christian union for which I had been laboring all my life." But he had to get some one else to read it, under the impression that his physical strength might break down if he should attempt to read it himself. It was received with an ovation from a crowded audience in Columbus Hall, the applause only terminating some time after its conclusion. Dr. Godet, after reading it in Switzerland, said: "It is magnificent. This is the exclamation with which I rise from the perusal of your paper." It was, as it seems to us, the best, the profoundest of the many able papers that were read at this great meeting.

After his return from Chicago his bodily strength was exhausted. He suffered agonizing pain at the region of the heart. The nights were spent in restless insomnia. On the 18th of October, he experienced a second stroke of paralysis. Consciousness remained but speech was gone, and he communicated with those around by imperfect signs. During his last night on earth, he listened to portions of Scripture, favorite hymns, the Creed, the Litany and the Te Deum. At the name of Jesus he became agitated, and in an effort to lift up his arm, as if to point upwards towards heaven, his spirit returned to God who gave it, calmly and peacefully, in the early morning of October 20, 1893. It was during the same week of the year, and on the same day of the week in which he had appeared before the Synod at Lancaster one year previously. The funeral services in the Church of the Covenant

were deeply impressive. The body was laid in Woodland Cemetery, and on the granite shaft, above his name, are the appropriate words, *Vivat inter Sanctos*.

The religious periodicals of all the Protestant denominations united in rendering a noble tribute to his memory. They testified to his vivid sense of order, his clear head and broad outlook; to his wonderful activity and industry; to his comprehensive knowledge, unequalled in America; his marvellous memory and assiduity; his leadership in the scholarship of the country; to his warm heart and lovable qualities; to his translation of German thought into American thinking and its adaptation to American wants; to his position as the representative of no one but all of the Protestant Churches and an honor to all; and to the wide and beneficent influence he exerted upon the Christian thought of the age, and his position as one of the best in the American Church, whose impress will be permanent. He was the author or editor of over 150 publications, books or pamphlets, and perhaps as many or more newspaper articles. *Requiescat in pace*.

This sketch of Dr. Schaff's remarkable career is, we are aware, very incomplete, and we can only refer our readers to his "Life" so ably and fully set forth by his son, now walking in his footsteps.

NOTE.—Several articles intended for this issue of the REVIEW had to be laid over for want of room. They will appear in the April number, and meanwhile the authors are kindly asked to have patience with us, and to continue their work in behalf of the REVIEW.

EDITOR.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

THE ARCHEOLOGISTS AND THE BIBLE.

During a recent excavation on the site of the ancient city of Corinth there was found a marble slab containing the inscription: "The Synagogue of the Hebrews." On this event the remark is made by an influential religious newspaper that, "This is only another illustration of the many ways in which the Biblical history both of the Old and New Testament is being confirmed by exploration and discovery." This remark illustrates a somewhat common tendency at the present time to look to archeology for a vindication of the traditional views of the Bible, which are by many regarded as essential to the maintenance of the truth of Christianity. The archeologists, it has been said, have routed the higher critics. The pick and the spade have demonstrated, in the opinion of some, not only that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, and that David was the author of the Psalms, but also that every statement contained in the Old Testament must be taken as veritable history. Some have even gone so far as to maintain that the doctrines of traditional theology have been wonderfully confirmed by archeological discoveries. Thus, for instance, we remember a writer who some years ago maintained in all seriousness that the doctrine of vicarious atonement had received an unexpected support from the discovery of altars and representations of sacrificial scenes in the ruins of ancient cities; as if the fact of sacrificial offerings in the ancient world had ever been doubted by anybody, and as if that fact could be regarded as establishing a Christian doctrine.

The archeologists whose writings are supposed to have rendered the most valuable services to the cause of the Bible are Professors Hommel and Sayce. Fritz Hommel's work, in which he is supposed to have annihilated Wellhausen, was translated and published some time ago by the "Society for Promoting Christian

Knowledge," of London. The translation, however, is said to be so defective and incorrect that it often misrepresents the mind of the author. And this misrepresentation seems not to be wholly accidental or involuntary, but intentional, the purpose being plainly to make Professor Hommel say things against the higher criticism which he does not intend to say. Professor A. H. Sayce, of Oxford, however, whose work, "*The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*," is most frequently appealed to in favor of the traditional views of the Bible, has written in English, and there exists no difficulty in getting at what he means to say. We have before us now the fourth edition of this work, published in 1894, and, though Professor Sayce has published other works since then, we presume that this one still represents the state of his mind with sufficient accuracy to enable us to understand what he thinks of the achievements and claims of the higher critics. At any rate it is the work whose publication was heralded not long ago as a death-blow to the whole tribe of critics, and which caused its author to be hailed by the most ardent advocates of traditionalism as a very Daniel come to judgment.

And there can be no doubt that Professor Sayce, in general, means to be opposed to the higher critics. That this opposition, however, is not as complete and thoroughgoing as is by some imagined, becomes at once plain from the first sentence of his preface. "I am well aware," he says, "that the pages which follow will satisfy neither the 'higher critics' nor their extreme opponents, and that every effort will be made to dispute or minimize the archeological evidence which they contain." Then he goes on to say that the great body of the religious public consists neither of "higher critics" nor of uncompromising "apologists," but of plain people who want to know the truth, and that for their edification he proposes to present the "marvellous testimony of Oriental archeology to the antiquity and historical character of the Old Testament." The fact is that Professor Sayce himself is a historical or higher critic no less than are those whom he opposes. He is a critic as well as an archeologist, and holds by no means to the positions of the traditional apologist. He disagrees with

many of the conclusions of the critical students of the Bible, as these also disagree among each other; but his disagreement with them is not fundamental, and they are greatly mistaken who have been led to believe that he holds the old traditional views of the authorship and inspiration of the Bible. Every page of his book, in fact, affords evidence to the contrary.

On the points most in dispute between the critics and the traditionalists, namely, the origin of the Pentateuch, Professor Sayce is decidedly on the side of the critics. "One of the most assured results of the literary analysis of the Old Testament records," he says, "has been the existence of documents of different age and authorship in the Pentateuch. Opinions may differ widely as to the authorship of certain passages and the dates to which the several documents are to be assigned, but about the general fact of the composite character of the Pentateuch competent critics of all schools are now agreed. The literary foundation upon which the history and religion of Israel rested is, in its present form, a composite work," p. 31. The component parts of this work he supposes to have been derived from widely different sources. For instance, he finds Babylonian, Canaanitish and Egyptian elements in Genesis. "The Elohistic account of the creation" he says, "contains echoes of Babylonian philosophy, and the Jehovistic account carries us directly to Babylon," p. 95. In fact, he holds that "the starting point of the story of creation in Genesis 2 was an old Sumerian legend," p. 93. The tenth chapter of Genesis, he thinks, did not assume its present form until the time of Ezekiel, p. 9, and "is not concerned with genealogical, but with geographical relations," p. 122. "There are narratives and statements in the Old Testament," he writes, "as to which the scepticism of the critic has been shown to be justified. The judgment he (the critic) has passed on the so-called historical chapters of the Book of Daniel has been abundantly verified by the recent discoveries of Assyriology," p. 27. What would Dr. Pusey, if he were now living, say to that? As to the historical books of the Old Testament Professor Sayce admits that the higher critics are probably right in holding that in their present form they are com-

pilations of comparatively recent date, p. 60. These are only a few specimens of the admissions which Professor Sayce makes to the higher criticism on almost every page of his book. And this is the champion who was proclaimed sometime ago to have routed the whole critical host! Surely the traditionalists must be very hard up, or else very dull, when they are willing to trust their cause to such a champion.

But Professor Sayce contends that the Old Testament Scriptures are in the main historical, and in this respect he thinks he is at variance with at least some of the critics. Indeed, many of the statements whose historicalness has been questioned by some of the critics, Professor Sayce maintains, have been vindicated by the discoveries of Oriental archeology. Thus, for instance, he believes that evidence has been discovered for regarding Abraham and Melchisedek as historical personages. The names of the Oriental kings who in the time of Abraham are said to have made war upon the kings in the vale of Siddim are believed to have been met with on Babylonian tablets, and so the events recorded in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis may well be believed to have really occurred. The name of Jerusalem, or *Urusalim*, is mentioned in the Tablets of Tel-el-Amarn; and this proves that such a city existed at a very early time, as the Bible tells it did. These Tablets also inform us that, at the time when they were composed, the inhabitants of Palestine were hard pressed by warlike invaders from the south, whose name was *Abiri*, or *Chabiri*, and these Chabiri may have been the *Hebrews*; and if they were then we have here an archeological proof of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites. These Tablets, which are written in Babylonian cuneiform characters, moreover, prove that the art of writing was known in Palestine at a time anterior to the Israelitish conquest; and hence it may easily be believed that Moses wrote the Pentateuch in the Arabian desert, although Professor Sayce is of the opinion that that belief must be somewhat modified. What is strictly proven is the *probability* that Moses *could write*, although between that probability and the actual composition of the Pentateuch there are several degrees

of difference. These are a few illustrations of the service which archeology has rendered to belief in the historical character of the Bible. It should be remembered, however, that so far as the main facts of the Biblical history are concerned they are not generally disputed by the higher critics. Professor Cornill, of Koenigsberg, for instance, would be ready to admit every claim to historicity for the Bible made by Professor Sayce and other archeologists of a similar spirit. That Israel once existed as a nation; that it was connected with Abraham and the Semites of the Euphrates valley; that, before taking permanent possession of Canaan, the nation, or at least parts of it, sojourned in Egypt and in the Sinaitic peninsula; that the nation was consolidated through the influence of Moses, who was its first lawgiver; that it finally, after a long series of wars, established itself in Canaan, and there developed into a most peculiar people, professing and practicing a monotheistic religion, doctrinally and ethically far in advance of the religions of surrounding and kindred nations—these are facts which we presume no critic would deny, and which certainly all who are not critics will cheerfully acknowledge. And the great majority of critics would go farther and acknowledge the historical credibility of the statements of the Bible generally, just as they acknowledge the historical credibility of Herodotus or Tacitus.

But, now, what has been accomplished when the historical character of the Bible has in this way been established? What have the archeologists done when they have proven that the leading historical facts recorded in the Bible are not inventions, but actual events? Have they added anything to the religious value of the Bible? Have they made it more credible as a record of divine revelation? These questions, we believe, would have to be answered in the negative, even if it could be shown that archeology had proven far more of the *details* of Biblical history than Professor Sayce or any one else will dare to claim. All that the archeologists can claim to have *proven* in regard to the history recorded in the Bible was known and believed long before, but does not touch that *religious truth* for the sake of which the Bible

was written. We have no doubt that both archeology and the higher criticism may be of service to the cause of religion and to the better understanding of the Bible; but so far as the essential truth of the Bible is concerned we are convinced that it has neither been materially benefited by the historical testimony of the archeologists, nor materially injured by the historical denials of the higher critics. The service rendered to the Bible by modern archeological discoveries is sometimes compared to the service rendered to the poems of Homer by the discoveries of Schlieman. What, then, is the nature of that service? It is merely immaterial and formal. These discoveries on the sites of the ancient cities of Troy, Mycenæ and elsewhere prove that the scenes described by Homer, so far as their formal setting is concerned, are not pure inventions of the imagination. They prove that there once were such cities as are mentioned, and that people lived in them somewhat after the manner described in these poems. The articles of household furniture, the specimens of pottery and jewelry and the weapons of war found in these ancient ruins, bespeak a stage of civilization and a mode of life very much like the representations contained in Homer's glowing verses. Schlieman's discoveries also prove that Troy must have experienced, not once only, but repeatedly, the horrors of war, and that she perished at last by the sword and the torch; but to the question by *whose* sword her people were slain, and by *whose* torch she was laid in ashes, archeology can return no answer. Of the personalities of Agamemnon, Menelaus and Achilles, and of Priam and Hector, in whose passion and fate we are so much interested when we read the pages of Homer, archeology knows nothing. It knows nothing of the particular battles between Greeks and Trojans on the windy plains of Troy. It does not prove the historical reality of Homer's representations of the exploits of the gods and goddesses fighting on one side or the other of the human combatants. In short, of the *life* and *spirit* which we meet in the poems of Homer, and which are the things that chiefly interest us, archeology knows nothing, and can know nothing.

And the same relation holds also between archeology and the

Bible. Oriental archeology may tell us much, for instance, of the Babylonian and Assyrian kings, and of their wars and exploits in Palestine and elsewhere; but of what Jehovah had to do with all this it can tell us nothing. It may assure us that the name of *Abraham* has been found on some Babylonian bricks, but it can tell us nothing of the Biblical Abraham and of his faith. That there were such cities as Hebron, Jericho, Samaria, Jerusalem and Bethlehem nobody has ever doubted. But that the divine deeds of which the Bible speaks were really wrought in these places has been doubted by the sceptic, and archeology can bring forward nothing that will stop the sceptic's mouth or confirm the faith of the believer. To one who has any knowledge of ancient history nothing will seem more likely than that there should have been a Jewish synagogue in the once populous and flourishing commercial city of Corinth; and the discovery of a piece of marble with the inscription, "Synagogue of the Hebrews," will, therefore, not add anything very important to his knowledge. It will tell him nothing of Paul, of Aquila and Priscilla, or of Apollos, and of their faith, and hopes, and labors. To the Christian believer such a venerable relic will be interesting, and will serve to bring to his mind the life and fortunes of sainted men and women; but that it will in any degree confirm his faith in the Biblical history, and especially in that divine truth which forms the spiritual core of that history, we do not think is probable. The two things lie in different spheres. The marble slab with its inscription may point to an historical fact—the existence of a synagogue at Corinth—but it will not make it a whit easier to believe in the doctrine of Jesus and the resurrection which Paul may have preached in that synagogue. Christian faith is not begotten of such facts and is not based upon such facts. It has its origin in a different and higher revelation. The streets and hills of Bethlehem are there as they were in the days of David and of Joseph, and archeology may tell us many curious things about them; but it can tell us nothing of the inner life of the ancient shepherd boy, nor of the birth of the divine child, nor of the song of the angels which proclaimed that event.

And what can archeology tell us of the life, and teaching, and death of Jesus Christ? That Jesus lived and was crucified in the days of Pontius Pilate no infidel doubts; but that His death was the death of the Son of God, who died for the sin of the world, and that He rose again on the third day, has been doubted; and this is a truth which cannot be proven, or indeed affected at all, by any archeological study of the streets of Jerusalem, or of the course of her walls and the position of her gates.

The truth of Christianity—the truth which the Bible is intended to convey—is truth of a different order from that with which archeology can have anything to do. The former is spiritual; the latter is earthly. Archeology may introduce us to the earthly scenes in which the divine revelation was first given to men, and that may be interesting and helpful, too, so far as the mere understanding of the Biblical narrative is concerned; but archeology cannot furnish any premises from which the truth of the divine revelation can now be inferred with convincing cogency. The divine truth of Christianity is self-authenticating, and can be apprehended only by immediate contact with the divine revealing mind. Archeology can show us the platform on which the Biblical history was enacted, but it cannot show us the soul of that history; indeed, it cannot even show that that history had any soul at all different from that which animates the common course of human events. With the soul of that history one can come in contact only as Peter, for instance, came in contact with the divinity of Christ, not by any revelation of flesh and blood, not by any arguments thrown up by pick and spade on the ruins of ancient cities, but only by a direct revelation of the Spirit of God through faith. And one who has not this faith cannot be convinced of the truth of the Bible by anything that may be brought forward, either by archeology, or history, or science.

So far as the main facts related in the Bible come within the field of ordinary history they may be admitted, and, in fact, are admitted by everybody; but such admission, as we well know, is not faith in Christianity. A certain king is said to have asked a professor of theology for a proof of the truth of the Bible in

three words, and the latter replied: "The Jews, Sire." But what does the existence of the Jew now prove? Only that he must have existed in past ages. The present existence of the Jewish race does not prove the divine calling of the Jews any more than the existence of the Gypsies proves a divine calling in their case. And so the proof of the historical existence of Jesus is no proof of His divine and mediatorial character where that character is not apprehended by an immediate revelation through faith of the glorified Christ Himself. That at least was the way in which St. Paul learned to know the character of Christ. Hence we cannot but regard the appeal which is so often made to "the pick and the spade" for the truth of the Bible and of Christianity as being mistaken and misleading. It mistakes the true nature of the Christian faith. It supposes that faith is only an inference from premises outside of itself. And it raises a false issue, and can, therefore, in the end only be harmful to Christianity. It supposes that the acceptance of certain historical facts is belief in the truth of the Bible, and that consequently the critics, who refuse to regard certain statements of the Bible, like the story of Creation, of the Fall, of the Flood, or of the Tower of Babel, as in the ordinary sense historical, are not believers in the Bible and, therefore, not Christians. But this judgment against the critics, we think, is obtained at too great a cost. For it will presently be perceived that the discoveries now so confidently appealed to as establishing the truth of the Bible do, in fact, not touch that truth, and that what they do establish has been known and acknowledged long since. And when that discovery comes to be made, the faith of many will be weakened instead of strengthened by this argument of the pick and the spade. The work accomplished by the archeologists may be interesting, and instructive and valuable; only let it not be falsely exaggerated to the ultimate injury of Christian faith.

HUMAN SOLIDARITY AND PERSONALITY.

Every single man is a member of a larger organic whole, by whose fortunes and condition he is deeply and vitally affected.

This fact of human nature has been called the *law of solidarity*. But every single man is also an independent individual, capable of free agency, and responsible for his acts and character. This fact may be called the *law of personality*. These two forms or laws of being belong necessarily to every human individual, and in the normal man they coexist without mutual interference or encroachment.

The law of solidarity includes two subordinate laws, namely, the law of *heredity* and the law of *environment*. By the operation of the former of these laws the individual inherits from past generations the general nature and qualities of his psychophysical constitution. The bodily organism, with its tendencies and aptitudes, its strength or its weakness, its temperament and its predisposition, is an inheritance from the past. The determining factors of this inheritance are the race, the nation and the family to which one belongs. Even the conditions of earth and climate under which one is born and reared have something to do with the peculiar habits of his physical constitution. But the psychical no less than the physical constitution is profoundly influenced and determined by the law of heredity. Mental peculiarities, dispositions, tendencies and moods are hereditary gifts of nature as really as is the color of the skin or the shape of the nose. Talents, or mental endowments, fitting an individual for any particular vocation or employment, have come to him, not from himself, but from the power that has made him. Should it be said that that power is not nature, or any law of heredity, but God, the almighty and personal Creator, we should willingly accept the proposition, maintaining, however, that nature and heredity are the instruments with which God works in the continuous process of the evolution of the world. It is contended even by some philosophers that the *a priori* intuitions of the mind, like the ideas of substance, number, causation, and of right and wrong, are not the product of an original constitution of the soul, but the result of an accumulated experience of the race preserved from generation to generation by inheritance. But this is only equivalent to saying that the human soul itself

is the product of a progressive evolution, modified in each generation by the experience of all the generations going before. However this may be, it is certainly true that the human soul now begins its existence with well defined mental capacities and tendencies which it has not given to itself. And this is true also of moral tendencies. There are feelings, appetites, desires, impulses, giving rise to modes of moral action and sentiments, which are peculiar to every individual, and which the individual has not produced himself. There is, then, a physical, an intellectual and a moral nature in the individual, which he has not given to himself, and for the possession of which he is not responsible. In this respect the individual has not made himself, and could not be otherwise than he is. He is the creature of heredity.

But the law of solidarity includes also the law of social environment and influence, which binds all contemporaneous individuals together in an organic whole, by the condition of which each one is profoundly affected and modified. In order to appreciate the extent of this influence of environment one need only to reflect upon the immense importance, for the education of the individual, of the common language and of common modes of thought and opinion. The language which an individual is to speak, and which is to serve as the expression and vehicle of his intellectual life, is made for him by the society in which he lives. The same is true also largely of the philosophical, political, moral and religious opinions which one may entertain. They are to a large extent made for him, not by him. The Catholic thinks like a Catholic, and the Protestant like a Protestant, largely because of their respective social environments. But the influence of environment extends even farther than this. Indeed, the individual's whole life and fortune are bound up with the life and fortune of the contemporaneous society to which he belongs. His enjoyment and his sorrow are conditioned by the fortune and misfortune of the nation of which he is a member. If the nation is prosperous the individual will be likely to prosper, and if the nation is in adversity the indi-

vidual will sympathize with that adversity. Nor does it make any difference by what means such national adversity may be produced. It may be produced by natural conditions, like the occurrence of drought and the failure of the crops, or it may be produced by the wicked action of leading and perverse men. The result will be the same so far as the members of the body politic are concerned. The disturbance of the currency by self-seeking politicians, or its contraction by heartless capitalists, the cornering of breadstuffs by unscrupulous speculators, and the oppression of the labor market by conscienceless manufacturers, may bring poverty and want, sickness and death to thousands of innocent persons. An unscrupulous ship owner or tenement-house proprietor may scatter the seeds of disease through a whole country and cause trouble and sorrow to thousands of families. So indissolubly are men linked together in the organism of society that if one member suffers they all suffer, and if one rejoices they all rejoice. This whole relation is beyond the control of the individual will, and its results are but little affected by the individual's intelligence and character.

But, now, over against this law of solidarity, which seems to involve the individual inextricably in the common lot of the general life of humanity, past and present, there stands the law of personality, which separates the individual from the common life of the whole and makes it an independent center of existence and action. According to this law every individual, while rooted in the soil of universal human nature, is also an independent person—a self that feels and knows itself as self-existent, that is self-determining and free, and, therefore, responsible for itself and its acts. While the human individual possesses a nature that is determined by a chain of circumstances running back to the dawn of creation, it also possesses personality that is supernatural and free. *Nature* is that which is *born*, or produced without itself having any agency in the process of its becoming. The *supernatural*, on the contrary, is that which is above the chain of nature, and, therefore, not subject to the necessary law of causation—that which is not made, but makes itself, and whose exist-

ence and quality are dependent upon its own free activity. In this sense the human personality is something supernatural. And this supernatural being, existing in relation to a nature which it has not given to itself, but of which it is at least relatively independent, is the subject of moral actions and of moral character. Morality is not the mere product of the individual's nature. On the contrary, the very essence of the moral process consists, in part at least, in making the nature a subservient instrument of the personality. Nor is morality the *spontaneous* product of the person, as the flower is the spontaneous product of the plant. That idea would reduce the personality itself to the condition of a natural being—a *nature* determined by an indefinite chain of precedent circumstances. Morality is the *free* or *volitional* product of personality. It does not merely flow forth from the person as water flows from a well; nor is it inherited from the past. No individual is ever born with a moral character either good or bad. Virtue and merit, sin and guilt are not hereditary. Personality, with its functions of reason and will is not *determined* by inheritance. It may, indeed, by its own act give itself up to the hereditary tendencies of nature; but then that itself is something immoral, because it is a personal act. Nor can moral character be the product of environment. The person may, indeed, surrender himself to the influence of environment, and thus suffer his character to be formed for him; but that would be an abdication of his own power which could only be volitional, and for which the person would, therefore, be responsible.

It is difficult, doubtless, to draw a line between these two great laws of human nature and to tell precisely where the one ends and the other begins. Yet great confusion and error will result in important spheres of thought by a failure to distinguish them. There exists a strong tendency at the present time to emphasize the law of solidarity and to ignore the full import of the fact of personality. This is often done by a school of scientists in the interest of a particular theory. Here the existence of the soul as an entity distinct from the body is either entirely ignored or its significance at least is reduced to a minimum. The soul is

either regarded merely as an efflorescence of the body, deriving all its qualities from the latter, or, if it is allowed to have a distinct existence, it is supposed to be so united with the body as to be wholly determined by its conditions. And as the conditions of the body are hereditary, so then must also be the conditions of the soul; and by these conditions the functions of personality are determined. There is, then, no such thing as freedom. What men regard as such is merely a phenomenon, not a reality. The will is determined by motives, and motives are created by appetites and desires originating in the physico-psychical organism in consequence of its interaction with its environment. What is called morality is conduct; not, however, conduct determined by the idea of an end, but merely by an efficient cause connected with the chain of causation in nature. And in order to produce any change in conduct there can be no use in any appeal to the will and conscience, or in the presentation of *moral motives*; what is required is a modification in the chain of circumstances which determine a man's motives. This is at present the accepted theory of many so-called moral reformers. They scout the idea of accomplishing anything of importance for the improvement of mankind by *mere moral suasion*, or by the preaching of a Gospel that appeals mainly to the conscience and will of men. Their only hope is in the change of external conditions and institutions. This is especially the case with many temperance reformers. They have no faith in appeals to the manhood of an individual. In fact, they regard the manhood of the individual as merely the product and sport of circumstances. The man who has in him the appetite for strong drink, whether by inheritance or through influence of environment, simply *cannot* resist, and the only thing that can be done to save him is to remove from him the chance of indulgence by the legal prohibition of the manufacture of liquor. And so, generally, morality can be effected, not by exhorting men to resist temptation, but only by removing from them the means of temptation. It was a mistake, therefore, that there was a tree of temptation allowed to grow in Paradise.

But the law of solidarity is also often unduly magnified and

the law of personal freedom depreciated in the interest of systems of theology. What else than this is it when sin and guilt are declared to be hereditary, and when moral character is supposed to have been formed for the individual by an event antecedent to his will, for which he is nevertheless supposed to be responsible and justly punishable? This view presupposes that the will emerges into activity with a bad moral tendency, or determination, which it has not given to itself. Moral qualities are thus made to be hereditary, as much as are the physical qualities of the body. These hereditary moral qualities the individual cannot help having. They spring from a sin not his own, and yet he is responsible for them. Thus a man is born with a liability to punishment for a sin with the commission of which he had no more to do than he had to do with the color of his skin. The reasoning by which this view is established is short. Humanity is a whole, and this whole embraces the individuals as parts; and what is true of the whole must, therefore, also be true of the parts embraced in it. But, now, Adam was the whole race, and when he sinned *humanity* sinned; consequently all men are guilty of that sin, besides being partakers of the vitiosity of nature which was introduced into humanity by that first sin. This logical realism is sometimes fortified by a species of metaphysical realism, which supposes that the soul of one man contains in itself germinally the souls of all his descendants; somewhat as the outer tube of a telescope contains other tubes enclosed within it, which may be pulled out when they are wanted. In this way the soul of Adam contained within itself the souls of all men, and when he sinned they all sinned and became affected with depravity and guilt, in like manner as Levi is said to have offered tithes while he was yet in the loins of Abraham; although the writer of Hebrews, who makes this statement, introduces it with an *ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν*, showing that he did not regard it as strictly correct in point of fact. But the extension of the law of solidarity into the moral sphere is supposed to be justified also by the results of experience and observation. Do we not see suffering and death reigning everywhere in the human world—even over infants who have com-

mitted no personal sins? But suffering and death can be nothing else than the penalty of sin. Hence dying infants, who have committed no sins of their own, must be suffering punishment for the sins of their ancestors, or at least for that agency which they had in the sin of Adam when they were yet in his loins. And more than this: we see that individuals are suffering in consequence of national and social sins; but, as no suffering is admissible except as punishment for sins, we must conclude that the poor child which starves because a Chicago millionaire has made a corner in wheat is punished for that millionaire's sins!

Now all this may be logical, but it can not be true. The sound reason and conscience of mankind will laugh all such logic to scorn. The unsophisticated conscience of mankind teaches that there can be no punishment where there is no guilt, and that there can be no guilt where there is no personal agency. Guilt is the condition of one who has sinned, and one who has not sinned can neither be guilty himself nor can he bear the guilt of another. One of the most common words for *guilt* in Greek is *aitia*. But *aitia* means *cause*, and the use of the word implies that the guilty person is the *cause* of his own behavior. And it is this, and this only, that makes him liable to punishment. The prophet of Israel lays down the immutable truth on this subject, when he says: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die; the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him," Ezek. 18: 20. Guilt and punishment, then, do not go along with the law of solidarity. Infants must not be supposed to sicken and die in the way of punishment for the sins of their ancestors; nor must individuals be supposed to be punished for the sins of society. It is true—and it is a mysterious fact—that one person may suffer in consequence of another's sins; but such suffering is not punishment, for there is no sense of guilt and no feeling of retribution. One person could only bear the punishment of another's sins if he should make them his own by an act of personal volition, that is, by repeating or approving

them. When the first martyr Stephen was stoned by a mob of infuriated Jews, "Saul was *consenting* unto his death," and that made him partaker of their guilt. In like manner the citizen who by his vote helps to keep in office a corrupt man, or sustains an unjust policy of the government, as well as he who apologizes for these wrongs, does, in fact, consent to them and is himself guilty; and for this guilt he will in due time get his punishment. And the fact that he is not now "troubled as other men are" is no proof that he is innocent any more than the suffering of others is a proof of their guilt. But how, then, shall we explain the existence of suffering, if it is not necessarily a punishment of sin? How can a just God permit innocent suffering? This question might be answered by asking another, namely, How can a just God suffer one person to be punished for the sins of another? Surely this is not the way to vindicate the righteousness of God. It is better to acknowledge that we stand here in the presence of a mystery which we cannot now explain. Certainly the explanation which makes of it only penalty of sin throws all moral ideas into confusion, and does not elevate our conception of the character of God. We shall, doubtless, have to admit that pain may have other ends to serve besides those of punitive justice. As pleasure is not the highest good, so neither is pain the supreme evil. In fact, it may be no evil at all, in the grand economy of God, but a good. We see, for instance, that the same law of solidarity which serves as a channel for the transmission of evil may also serve for the transmission of good, and may minister to the progress of humanity in the divine life. And if after all there should remain any inequality in this world, God has eternity before Him in which to make all things right.

But if it were a mistake to deny the law of personality in favor of that of solidarity, it would be equally a mistake to deny the law of solidarity in favor of that of personality. Personal freedom is, indeed, a reality, and must be so regarded in order that justice may be done to the interest of morality. But freedom has its limitations. The person is free only within certain bounds. No one, for instance, can sever his connection with the

race, and throw off its influence. And freedom itself is a good that can only be realized by moral action. No man has ever been born free, except in a merely political sense, just as no man has ever been born intelligent. Freedom in the real sense is a state of the will that can only be acquired by right or conscientious volitional action, as intelligence is a state of the intellect that can only be attained by means of right intellectual exercise. The human person or self stands in the midst of manifold relations which always condition its existence, but from the absolute control of which it must escape in order to be free ; and by thus gaining a relative independence of the forces conditioning it, it moralizes itself and its nature. In personality the human individual thus lifts itself out of the embosoming matrix of the general life of humanity, not by breaking the bonds which connect it with that life, but by consciously transcending their limitations and making them stuff for moral action. As a seed forming in the ovary of a flower is at first organically connected with the placenta, and determined by the general life of the plant, but when ripe loosens itself from its connection with the pistil and attains to separate existence ; so man is destined by personal and moral action to overcome the bonds, physical and psychical, which connect him with the natural organism of humanity, not that he may afterwards take a position of isolation, but that he may immediately fall into new relations in the higher moral organism of humanity, which we call the kingdom of God. This is the proper task which is set before the individual man to perform. And in the right performance of this task consists the moralization of his nature and of his powers. Many fail in the performance of this task, and so, in fact, never become entirely free moral agents. They do not make their own that gift of liberty which is essential to their true manhood. And the difficulty of the task to be performed, it can easily be seen, will not be the same in the case of all men. Heredity and environment will present obstacles as well as inducements to moral action that will be widely different in different individuals. Some men start out on their career of moral development freighted with an evil heredity to which others

are happily strangers ; while others again have in their heredity and environment inducements to virtue which make its attainment an easy thing ; although it should not be forgotten that virtue is *denied* to no man, and cannot be gained without *effort* by any.

The bearing of this law upon ethical judgments will be at once obvious. It follows from it that the merit or demerit of the same act must be differently estimated in the case of different agents. This truth is to some extent recognized in the discretionary power given to courts of justice to vary within certain limits the penalty inflicted upon different persons for the violation of the same law. But this must always prove to be a very crude way of tempering justice. Only the omniscient Judge of the world will be able to do this perfectly, and the Day of Judgment will doubtless have many surprises in store for us all. But the principle of solidarity must also have an important bearing upon moral and social reforms. Morality, indeed, as we have seen in this article, is something personal ; and every person is responsible for his own moral action, and for no more. But personal agency, at least during its nascent period, and during the period of its incompleted development, cannot but be profoundly influenced both by heredity and environment. And this is a fact of which the social reformer is bound to take note. The abstract personal ethics of a former period is now felt to be inadequate to the moral problems which confront humanity. These problems can only be solved in the light which comes from a combination of the ethical principles with those sociological principles which we are only now beginning to understand. This is true in an especial sense, for example, of the temperance reform. It is well, of course, for the preacher to say that the only real temperance is that which consists in self-control, and that the power required for such self-control can only be that which comes from the grace of the Gospel. This is, indeed, true ; but it is also true that, unless supported by external, natural and social influences, the Gospel of temperance will in very many cases sound into deaf ears. And the Prohibitionists will ask triumphantly how long it will take to deliver the land

from the curse of intemperance if the saloons are allowed to make three drunkards while the Church people are engaged in saving one. But what is true of the temperance problem is true of every other moral and social as well as religious problem. In order to a successful solution they must be approached from the social as well as from the personal side. Man is nothing if he is not social, and this social side of his nature must be taken into account in any proper effort to promote his spiritual development. It has, indeed, been thus taken into account in the framing of the institutions of the Church. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was evidently designed to be the visible symbol and bond of that union among Christians which is so necessary in order to the proper development of their spiritual life. That from this simple design it was turned into a propitiatory sacrifice and rite of magic power was a stupendous perversion; but there are not wanting evidences now that, with the better understanding of the idea and nature of humanity, there has come also a better understanding of the Church and her ordinances.

REQUEST.—We kindly thank our friends for their contributions to the REVIEW, and ask them to continue to favor us. Brethren, write for the REVIEW. Write fresh articles, on live subjects; remembering that the object of the REVIEW is to serve as a medium of intercourse between its readers and the living thought of the age. Write on paper of uniform size, so that the length of an article can be estimated before it goes to the printer, on one side of the paper only, and in a clear, legible hand, so that editor and printer can read without difficulty. Put your copy into the shape in which you desire it to appear on the printed page. Do not expect to make changes in the proof, except corrections, for that is making the printer do work twice for which he is only paid once.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

AN OUTLINE OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. By William Newton Clarke, D.D.
Professor of Christian Theology in Colgate University, Hamilton, New York.
Pages 488. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1898.

This volume is what it purports to be, namely, an *Outline of Christian Theology*. It is an *outline*, not a *library*. It omits nothing essential in doctrinal theology, or in what has commonly been called *dogmatics*, with perhaps one exception; but it does not propose to cover the whole field of theological science. The author, doubtless remembering that there are other departments of theological learning which have their legitimate spheres, such as biblical exegesis, biblical theology, and history of dogmas, confines himself to a discussion of the leading questions of doctrinal theology as they present themselves in the light of the present day. Exegetical and historical proofs he leaves to the sciences to which they probably belong. This enables him to cover the whole ground of doctrinal theology in a single volume, and to cover it so well that the reader will be able to get all the light there really is on any of the subjects that interest the theological thought of the age. There are some subjects on which the author is not afraid to confess ignorance. He does not belong to that class of theologians who are sure that they know everything. For this, too, as well as for the judicious discrimination of the limits of his science, the intelligent reader of this volume will be disposed to thank the author. In this age of specialization in theological science, as well as in everything else, the theological public is somewhat impatient of theological *compounds*, which necessitate the multiplication of ponderous volumes, and will be very glad to get a work like this of Dr. Clarke's, which can be read with as much pleasure as profit. And the acknowledgements of a limitation of knowledge on some points, as well as the cautious expression of opinion on others, will serve to inspire confidence in the ability and good judgment of the author.

Then, in the second place, this is an outline of *Christian theology*. It is based, not only nominally, but really upon the Christian revelation, or upon the self-manifestation of God in Christ. The author holds that there are two sources of theology, namely, the universe, including man, and the Christian revelation. God shows Himself in the constitution of nature and of humanity, in life and action, in act and fact; but He shows Himself especially in the person, and life, and character of Christ. God manifested Himself in what Christ actually was, and said and did; and this self-manifestation of God still continues in Christian experience through the operation of the Holy Spirit in

connection with the sacred scriptures. Now it is the actual illumination of any system of theological doctrines by the light of the Christian revelation that makes it really Christian. There have been systems of theology within Christendom that were not Christian at all. The conception which they presented of God, and of His character, and of His relation to the world and to men, was not the conception presented by Christ. In the volume before us this is not the case. The truth is here recognized that any theology worthy of the name now must be *Christological*. The term is not in this volume, but the thing is there. Dr. Clarke's theology is in the best sense Christological, for every subject is treated in the light of the revelation of Christ. The author makes no effort to *deduce* the theological system from some *idea* of the person of Christ, according to the scheme of some *Christo-centric* theologies; but Christ is the center of His system in the sense that He is the illuminating sun in the spiritual heavens, in the light of which only all spiritual truth can be seen in its proper essence and relations. And this, we are sure, is Christocentric, or as we prefer to say, Christological theology in the truest and best sense of the term.

After an introduction in which are defined the relations of theology to religion and to the several sources of revelation, and also the qualifications for the study of Christian theology, the theological material is treated in five parts, under the following heads: *God, Man, Sin, Christ, the Holy Spirit and the Divine Life in Man, and Things to Come*. Under the title of God we have a discussion of the nature and attributes of the deity and of the divine trinity and triunity. And we are glad to see that this discussion moves throughout on a Christian plane. In place of those conceptions of the divine sovereignty and decrees which make any system of theology into which they enter unchristian, because untrue to the revelation of God in Christ, we have here a series of conceptions which thoroughly authenticate themselves to the Christian consciousness, and which can be preached to this age without any fear of shocking the best Christian sensibilities. "The object of the moral government of God," we are told, "is the good of His creatures, not the glory of God, except as that appears in the good of His creatures," p. 146. God is a Father first and a Sovereign afterwards; and "with Him right makes might, not the reverse." He can possess "real authority over intelligent creatures only by being worthy of it." In the doctrine of God a distinction is made between *trinity* and *triunity*. "The divine trinity is God's threefold self-manifestation; the doctrine of the divine triunity is God's triune mode of existence," p. 161. On this subject the author remarks that "if we admit that the doctrine of the triunity is a revealed truth, we must admit that it is a truth that has been revealed through Christian thought partly outside of the New Testament," p. 165. It has its ground in the doctrine of the preëxistence of Christ in form of the Logos,

but it is not completed in the New Testament because the same ground does not exist for the divinity of the Holy Spirit. This statement will help to give us an idea not only of the author's way of thinking concerning the Trinity, but also of his way of thinking concerning the relation of theology to scripture.

We cannot here follow our author in the discussion of the various topics to which he directs our attention. Suffice it to say that his views are generally in harmony with those entertained in this country by the so-called *New Theology* men, and in Europe by the *Mediationists*. And those representatives of the old systems of theology, who have been so complacently telling us that there can be no such thing as *new* theology, that the old systems have exhausted the possibilities of theological thought, and that every effort to think along new lines will only lead back into one of the old systems, should be convinced of their error by studying this work of Dr. Clarke's. It certainly is not Calvinism, nor Lutheranism, nor Socinianism, nor Arminianism. It comes nearer to the complete representation of Christian truth than any of the old systems. In the doctrine of sin, and guilt, and punishment, in the doctrine of the atonement, of justification, and sanctification, and in the doctrine of the work of the Spirit in man, we certainly have in this volume an advance upon the old theologies. To read, for example, that "while sin is perpetuated in the world by the race-connection, so also is good;" and "that there is good as well as evil in the race;" that "guilt can neither be transmitted nor transferred, nor imputed from one person to another;" that "guilt is merely personal blameworthiness—the state of one who has sinned;" and that "Christ is not a substitute for personal goodness in man, but the author of such goodness produced by the Spirit;" this will, we think, be taken as an evidence that a new spirit has gotten into theology, which promises to make all things new.

But while we are able generally to endorse the positions taken in the volume before us, and while we cannot but regard the system of theology presented therein as a great improvement upon the current traditional systems, yet there are a few points in regard to which we feel inclined to offer criticism. One of these relates to the treatment of the Divine attributes. Dividing these into *modes of activity* and *qualities of character*, the latter are made to consist of *holiness* and *love*, but love is reduced to the condition of a quality of holiness, while holiness is defined as an inward character of perfect goodness, but goodness itself is left entirely undefined. We would prefer to make love fundamental in the character of God, and to regard holiness and righteousness as determinations of love, the former being its self-respect and the latter its respect for its object. The divine omniscience is defined as God's perfect knowledge of all that is or can be known, which we think is correct enough; but then the author seems to assume that omniscience implies a foreknowledge of the contingent acts

of free agents, an assumption which must lead to serious difficulties. In Christology the author seems to accept the *kenotic* theory of Christ's person, although he does not use the term. He holds that the divine element or spirit constituted the personality of Jesus; which makes the human nature anhypostatic, and supposes a depotentiation of the divine to the condition of an unconscious human soul-germ which gradually developed into the personality of Jesus. This theory, which has been a favorite theory with some theologians of the mediation school, we do not think does justice either to the human or to the divine nature. In justice to the author it should be stated, however, that he suggests another theory as a possible alternative in case his own should not be found to be satisfactory, namely, the theory that the divine element in Jesus "consisted in the extraordinary fullness of God imparted by the indwelling Spirit, and making His life and character to be a unique expression of God to men." But our most serious criticism on the volume before us relates to the absence of any discussion of the subjects of the *Church* and the *Sacraments*. We can understand the omission, of course, but to us it nevertheless seems to be a serious defect in a treatise on theology otherwise so excellent as this one. The conception of the Church has found a place in the primitive Christian Creed, and surely it is important enough to find a place in an outline of Christian theology. The Church is not an accident in the economy of Christianity; and it should therefore receive more prominent treatment than is generally accorded to it by the new-theology men in this country.

It remains only that we say a word yet in regard to the language and style of the work under notice. In this regard it cannot be too highly praised. The work is written in good and intelligible English throughout. The style is forcible, and commands the attention. It is such a work as one delights to read—thoughtful and profound always, but never hazy or obscure. No intelligent student need to have any difficulty in understanding it at the first reading, nor will such an one ever go to sleep over its pages. If all theological works and all sermons were written in as plain and intelligible language as is this volume, there would not be so much complaint about theological doctrine. Theological doctrine is unpopular mainly for two reasons, first, because it is so often unintelligible, and, secondly, because when it is intelligible, it is so often repulsive to the best Christian reason and sentiment of the present age. Treatises and sermons on "conveyed depravity" and "imputed guilt," for instance, composed in language so obscure and hazy as to hide their real meaning from the popular mind, cannot be in favor with intelligent Christian people. But here is a volume—an outline of theology embracing nearly every important theological topic, that is entirely free from these faults. It is manly, honest, straightforward, sound, vigorous, plain and intelligible. And the careful perusal and study of it, especially on the part of the younger men in the ministry, will have a men-

tally invigorating and exhilarating effect. It will be in a high degree helpful both in formulating and in expressing Christian truth. And we, therefore, sincerely and earnestly commend it to the favorable attention of our readers.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF JESUS. *An Essay in Christian Sociology.* By Shailer Mathews, A.M., Professor of New Testament History and Interpretation in the University of Chicago. Pages 235. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1897.

This work is a contribution to the rapidly growing sociological literature of the age. It is not a complete treatment of the science of sociology, which is now so assiduously cultivated, but an examination of the sociological principles contained in the teaching of Jesus. In the introductory chapter the author notices some objections to the idea that the teaching of Jesus contains any deliverances on the questions relating to the organization of society, which have become so absorbingly interesting in modern times. One of these objections grows out of the individualistic philosophy which has so largely dominated the theological and exegetical study of the New Testament since the Reformation. This philosophy would confine the effect of Christianity to the salvation of the individual, and leave society to go its own way as it has been going for ages past. But this is an abnormal separation of what God has joined together. Christianity is concerned with the salvation of *humanity* as well as with the salvation of *men*. A second objection to the idea that Jesus is responsible for any sociological teaching arises out of the fact that much of the sociological teaching of the present time is inconsiderate and hasty, and does not commend itself to the most sober Christian mind. To these grounds of objection we think the author might have added a third one, namely, the fact that the teaching of Christ is felt to be in conflict with much of the spirit of modern society. The anti-fraternal spirit which to so large an extent controls the life of society, cannot but feel itself condemned by the fraternal spirit which runs through the social teaching of Jesus, and must, therefore, be impatient with that teaching.

The author of the work before us holds, however, and we think rightly, that the teaching of Jesus is not sociological in *form*. Jesus was not a communist nor a socialist, not a paternalist in economics nor an advocate of *laissez faire*, not a democrat nor a monarchist in government; but He enunciated religious and ethical principles which, if left to their legitimate operation, would in time regenerate society as well as individual persons; and Jesus desired the one as much as the other. The central idea of the teaching of Jesus was His conception of the *Kingdom of God*, and that is the conception of a social organism which, though intended to reach into eternity, is to be established here on earth. Before our author, however, goes on to the discussion of the conception of the kingdom, he discusses, in the second chapter,

the conception of man as it is found in the teaching of Jesus. This is the conception of a "social being that finds his complete life only in losing it in the life of others," and this gives us the conception of Christian society as it is to be realized in the kingdom of God. With modern theologians and writers on ethics generally our author finds the highest good as conceived in Christianity to be the kingdom of God. This forms the subject of the third chapter. "By the Kingdom of God," we are here told, "Jesus meant an ideal (though progressively approximated) social order in which the relation of men to God is that of sons, and (therefore) to each other that of brothers," p. 54. The ideas of the fatherhood of God and of the brotherhood of men are, accordingly, declared to be the principal contents of the conception of the Kingdom of God. And this kingdom is to be established in this world, which is not constitutionally incompatible with it. "The world," we are told, "is not the demoniacal kingdom supposed by some scholars to have been established by Satan as a sort of counterpart to the Messianic, and from whose agents Jesus won a glorious victory," p. 59.

In the light of the principle of the Kingdom of God, then, there are treated, in successive chapters, *the family, the state, wealth, social life, the forces of human progress, and the process of social regeneration*. On the subject of the family, we are told, that "Jesus to a surprising degree anticipated to-day's belief in the equality of the sexes," but He was not an agitator, and could not have been, for "woman's rights" and "woman suffrage." The principles which He enunciated led an apostle to declare that "In Christ there is neither male nor female." On the subject of the state the author maintains that the caution which Jesus observed in speaking, and especially his words before Pilate in regard to the heavenly origin of governmental authority, do by no means "commit Him to the theory of the divine right of kings, not to mention the whole mass of pusillanimity and casuistry known as the doctrine of passive obedience." His fundamental principles are, however, not destructive of social order but only of its abuse and perversion to unrighteousness. On the subject of wealth Jesus has much to say, and Professor Mathews rightly devotes a good deal of space to the discussion of this subject. Of course, Jesus was not a teacher of political or social economics; but His teaching nevertheless contains principles on the subject of wealth, which will some day deliver the social organism from the economic curse which is now resting upon it. Indeed, so radical and so apparently revolutionary is His teaching, that some have taken it to be mere sanctified rhetoric that is utterly inapplicable to real life, while others, especially those who profit by the existing economic arrangements, grow nervous over it when anybody proposes to take it in earnest. "For this, if for no other reason," says Professor Mathews, "Men have slighted this phase of the teaching of Jesus, daring to trust Him as a Saviour from hell of

which He seldom spoke, but judging Him incompetent to establish upon earth that reign of love which was the chief object of His thought," p. 135. Wealth itself Jesus did not regard as an evil but as a good, "but as a good only when it is a social good and when its pursuit does not weaken those impulses within a man that go out towards his fellows and God, and so render him unfit for the kingdom of heaven. Inevitable and fearful punishment awaited the man whose wealth brought no joy to others than himself," p. 148. Selfishness, the anti-fraternal impulse, is the chief sin, for it makes the Kingdom of God itself impossible. "Jesus attacked bitterly the upper classes, and at times seemed unduly to praise the poor and needy, but it is a superficial study that does not discover that these attacks spring from His perception of the evident anti-fraternal, selfish, contemptuous spirit of the aristocrats," p. 171.

We cannot here give even a synopsis of the chapters on the *forces of human progress* and on the *process of social regeneration*. These chapters, like the balance of the book, are well worthy of careful study; and we cordially commend this book to the attention of our readers. There is no department of thought that demands more careful cultivation on the part of Christian ministers than that of sociology. The commonplaces of a generation ago will no longer do on the sociological questions which are now agitating the world. And here too, as in other departments, Biblical study must precede speculative and systematic thought; but it must necessarily lead on to this. It would be a mistake to suppose that some Scriptural formula must be found for every subject with which Christian thought may legitimately be concerned; and that where no such formula can be discovered, Christ can have nothing to say. Once Christ had something to say on the slavery question, although no word on the subject could be found in the Gospels; and now He has something to say on the wage question, the silver question, the tax question and other kindred questions. And what he has to say on these questions we shall not be able to understand without a deeper study of the New Testament; but His mind will not come to us, after all, in precise expressions of Scripture formulas. It will come, as it once came on the subject of slavery, in the Christian consciousness of the age; and when it once comes in such form, there will be no such thing as resisting it. These propositions may serve to define at once both the value and the limitations of such works as that which we have here had under consideration.

COLOSSIAN STUDIES. *Lessons in Faith and Holiness from St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon.* By H. C. G. Moule, D.D., Principal of Ridley Hall, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Pages 318. A. C. Armstrong and Son, 51 East Tenth Street, New York, 1898.

This is not a critical commentary in the ordinary sense; and yet it is accurate in scholarship, and the translation of the text

and the interpretation are based upon the best Greek version. The aim of the book is, however, practical and devotional. It is intended to lead the reader of the Bible, whether minister or layman, into such understanding of the sacred text as shall quicken his faith and minister to his edification. That the wants of the minister have not been forgotten is apparent from the fact that the Greek text has been made the basis of the exposition. And that ministers need something of this kind, not merely for homiletic purposes, but for the support of their own spiritual life, no one will doubt. The ordinary critical and theological commentary, while very necessary for the theological student and for the minister of the Gospel, if not complemented by something of a more practical and devotional kind, may tend to create a habit of mind which, while theoretically perhaps making high account of Biblical inspiration, has really but small reverence for the Bible and little skill in turning it to practical account for the edification of others. But the work before us is by no means intended merely for the theologians by profession. On the contrary, intelligent Christians generally will find it to be helpful to the right understanding of that portion of the Bible of which it treats.

While following the text of the epistles consecutively, the material is nevertheless presented in different sections under separate headings. Thus, for instance, we have such topics as "the pre-eminence of the Son of God," under which the great Christological passage in Col. 1: 15-20 is discussed; "redemption applied;" "the secret of God, and its power;" "pardon, life, and victory in the crucified and risen one;" "Christian Baptism;" "holy liberty in union with Christ," and so forth. As an illustration of the author's style and theology we quote a few sentences on the subject of baptism. "Quite sure I am," he says, "that by St. Paul, and by the primeval church generally, baptism was not regarded as a quasi-miraculous operation, through which as an action, and necessarily at its very time, a spiritual revolution took place within the recipient, or a spiritual spark was cast into his life. My deep belief is that the true apostolic idea of Baptism was that of the "sealing ordinance." * * * That view makes it, to the full, God's own sign-manual to His word, God's own seal at the foot of His charter of the salvation which is by faith. And thus it bids the Christian teacher and believer, in the full bright daylight of the gospel of grace and faith, make much of baptism, whether given to the adult as the sequel to faith or to the infant child of the Church in prospect of it." In this connection it may perhaps not be out of place to state that the author is an *Anglican* theologian, and that the work before us is dedicated to a bishop of the Anglican Church. This fact may serve to prove that in this work we have not the vagaries of a mere Baptist or Dissenter, but the above extract will also show that the author is not an "Anglo-Catholic." While he is an Episcopalian, he is perfectly *sane*.

We allow ourselves to quote one more passage. After the

author has described the Christian family and Christian society, bringing out in full relief the few strong features in which St. Paul has sketched them, he continues as follows: "And is all this mere rhetoric? Is it Utopia, *οὐτοπία*, a scene that never was and never will be? No; because of the Gospel which underlies the whole thing as its antecedent and condition. Schemes of perfect human concord, whether in the home or in the State (and certainly in the Church), which leave out the full Gospel, are predestined failures; they forget sin, and ignore its remedy; how can they but fail while man is a sinner? But St. Paul approaches the Christian home through the fullest possible truth as it is in Jesus; and then it becomes not Utopia, *οὐτοπία*, the place that is not, but Eutopia, *ευτοπία*, the happy place."

CHRISTIAN TRUTH AND LIFE. *Sermons*, By Milton Valentine, D.D., LL.D., Ex-President of Pennsylvania College, and Professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa. Pages 358. Price \$1.50. Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, Pa., 1898.

Books of sermons have their distinct place and use in Christian and especially theological literature. Every minister's library ought to contain a certain number of well-selected books of this kind. They would be of more service to him in his preparation for the pulpit than all the mass of "homiletic helps" which now comes pouring in upon him from all directions. Not that he should ever *appropriate* the sermons which they contain, as he is expected to *appropriate* the skeletons and outlines which are furnished to him in the magazines. That would be a sin against himself and against his people; and the sin would be as flagrant in the one case as in the other. The proper use to be made of collections of sermons is to study them as models, as the young painter studies the pictures of the great masters. In this way, serving as ideals of the sermonic art, they may be of immense account to the young preacher. There is no doubt that the sermons of F. W. Robertson have done more to form the homiletic habits of preachers in modern times than many treatises on homiletics have done. And they are still of great value in this regard, and can always be recommended to young preachers in search of ideals for sermonizing.

And we are glad to say that to the list of valuable collections of sermons we are able to add this volume of Dr. Valentine's. The volume contains twenty-six discourses on so many different topics. We are told in the preface that the selection was not made with reference to any theoretical principle. No particular system of doctrines is to be supported by means of these sermons. They are gathered from the author's pulpit ministrations on the general principle only that Christian truth has been given for Christian life. Many of the discourses included in the volume are baccalaureate sermons addressed to classes graduating from the college and theological seminary at Gettysburg. They are, of course,

prepared with care, and possess a special interest in view of the advice and direction given to young men just starting out upon the journey of life. All the sermons included in the volume are, however, of a high order, both as to thought and form. This, of course, would be expected, considering the source from which they come. They are a part of the best product, in the department of homiletics, of one of the foremost minds of the Lutheran Church of the present day; and they may be taken as models of sermonizing both in respect of form and in respect of thought—especially *Lutheran* thought; for it should be observed that the sermons are marked, at least so far as we have been able to examine them, by that peculiar flavor of orthodoxy which is characteristic of the Lutheran Church. By this, however, we do not mean to imply that the author is not a vigorous independent thinker, for these sermons furnish abundant evidence that he is.

As an illustration of the author's style and thought we quote a paragraph from the sermon on "The Ethical Aim of Christianity:" "Is not 'salvation,' about which we so 'joyously sing,' continually thought of as something for the *future*, for the *next world*, rather than as a present attainment of state and character—the kingdom of heaven simply an object of foreseeing faith, off somewhere among the stars, to be gotten into when death breaks up our present home, a preëmpted mansion in the Father's House when houses here fail? Faith takes out an insurance for the next world—against hell, and for an inheritance in the heavenly country. Even when Christians rise to the conception that salvation is meant to be a present reality, and heaven a thing begun now and here, how much of the whole idea is yet restricted to a little happy sentiment, a mere emotionalism, a sweet sense of adoption, enjoyment in worship, the æsthetic happiness of rites and ceremonies—possibly, too, the pleasure of what may be technically called 'Christian work'? The most rapturous emotionalism, or luxurious æsthetic formalism, is, however, often conjoined with uncertain morals and a life that will not bear the light of day. I think it is Philips Brooks that has declared that the business of Christians is still largely an illustration of the ethics of paganism. And when we look even at those features of the Church that are best, really rich with the pure life of grace and the divine power and excellence of redemption—where under inspired faith and consecration the workers of the Church, ministers and laymen, are showing a Christ-like devotion in rescuing the lost and evangelizing the world—is it not a sad fact that, even in this best range, effort is largely satisfied in simply bringing the subject of grace across the margin from condemnation to forgiveness, with credible profession of trust in Christ, but with hardly a conception of that complete regeneration into which forgiveness and adoption are to bring them, 'working out' the real salvation in a new life of duty, holiness, righteousness, love, goodness, real 'obedience to Him whose world men live in'?"

HOW TO READ THE BIBLE. *Hints for Sunday-school Teachers and other Bible Students.* By Walter F. Adeney, M.A., Professor of New Testament Exegesis, etc., New College, London. Pages, 135. Price 75 cts. Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House, New York, 1897.

How to read the Bible, is a question that interests not merely theologians and preachers, but Christians, at least *Protestant* Christians, generally. And intelligent Christian readers will find much valuable information and help in this little volume here brought to our notice. The work is written in a style that makes it intelligible to the non-professionable student of the Bible, and is especially intended to reach the large class of Sunday-school Teachers who have not the time to study the larger works. Ministers of the Gospel, however, and especially such as desire information in regard to the *new interpretation* which the Bible has received in recent times, will also find its perusal both instructive and profitable.

The work is divided into two parts, the first relating to the general *principles* of Bible study, and the second relating to the study of the *various parts* of the Bible. The right method of Bible study, according to this author, is not the *theological*, which consists in reading into the Bible a preconceived system of theological opinions, nor the *textual*, which consists in taking detached sentences and regarding them as absolute oracles holding good for all time and applicable under all circumstances. Some knowledge of the Bible may, of course, be obtained by these methods; but a much surer and better knowledge is gained by the *historical* method, which consists in the application to the Bible of those general principles of interpretation which are applicable to other literature. One of these principles is to study the Bible in the spirit in which it was written. "It is but applying the general condition for the successful pursuit of all study to the special qualities of this study to say that, as a kindred spirit of poetry in the soul is requisite for the understanding of Wordsworth, and a mind in harmony with Plato is necessary for an appreciation of the great *Dialogues*, so, not a poetic, not a philosophic, but a religious spirit is essential to a right comprehension of the Bible," p. 47. As a further illustration of the religious method of reading the Bible which our author advocates, we quote what he says on the books of Samuel and Kings: "These works are not bare annals. They are not like such simple narratives as we meet with in 'the father of history,' Herodotus; nor are they like the philosophic histories in which political principles are traced out, as in Thucydides. The great feature of the Hebrew history is the unique inspiration of insight into the moral and spiritual truths that emerge throughout the course of events. The writers help us to see God in history, because they themselves have discovered Him there. * * * The value of what is rightly named 'sacred' history does not lie so much in the religious nature of the events with which it is concerned as in the religious treatment of those

events, many of which are of a very ordinary character—that is to say, in the fact that it is history written by prophets, by men inspired with spiritual insight.” In conclusion we can only say that we regard it as not one of the least of the merits of the book before us, that the author accepts the results of the higher criticism of the Bible and shows how that criticism really enhances its value for the religious mind. In our day a work which shows how a man can preserve his faith in the Bible while he reads it in the light of the highest and best criticism, is of far greater value than one which attempts to prove that one can only preserve his faith in the Bible by shutting his eyes to the clearest principles of reason and the best-established results of historical criticism.

A VINDICATION OF THE “BULL APOSTOLICE CURE.” A Letter on Anglican Orders, by the Cardinal, Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Westminster. Pages, 122. Longmans, Green & Co., 39 Paternoster Row, London, 1898.

The object of this tract, which is in the form of a letter addressed to the “Most Reverend Lords,” the Anglican Archbishops of Canterbury and York, is to demonstrate to the comprehension of “Anglo-Catholics” that their Church is not the same as the Roman Catholic Church. It was occasioned by a letter from the heads of the Anglican Church to the highest dignitaries of the Papal Church in England, in which the former complain that the pope has done wrong to the English Church by not recognizing the validity of her orders, inasmuch as, barring some minor details, she is just the same as the Church of Rome. Whether this “Vindication” will accomplish its object we do not know. “Anglo-Catholics” seem to have peculiar minds, and it is hard to tell what sort of logic will affect them. But persons who are not “Anglo-Catholics,” we think, will generally be convinced that the Romanish dignitaries have abundantly proven their case; and they will wonder what fatality could have made the authorities of the English Church so stupid as to need any proof in so plain a matter.

Of course, the argument of the “Vindication” is the old argument used before in the Pope’s bull. In such a case nothing new could be expected. In fact, to attempt any new argument would seem to involve a kind of disrespect to the infallibility of the Pope; and, indeed, there seems to be no possibility of anything new in the way of argument on this subject. And so, then, the authors of the “Vindication” content themselves with thrashing over again the old arguments as to the defect in respect of *form* and *intention* of the ordinations effected with the ordinal of Edward VI. The presentation of these arguments, however is not uninteresting. Of special interest are the quotations from the English Reformers, proving that they had ceased to be Roman Catholics and did not *intend* to create bishops and priests or to offer sacrifices in the old Catholic sense. Here, for instance, is one

from Cranmer: "But it is a wondrous thing to see what shifts and cautions the Popish anti-Christians devise to color and cloak their wicked errors. * * * For the Papists, to excuse themselves, do say that they make no new sacrifice, nor none other sacrifice than Christ made (for they be not so blind but they see that then they should add another sacrifice to Christ's sacrifice, and so make His sacrifice imperfect); but they say that they make the self-same sacrifice for sin that Christ made Himself. And here they run headlong into the foulest and most heinous error that ever was imagined." That certainly is strong language, and might well have been written by Luther or Calvin. But there is other evidence to the same effect; and we may, therefore well wonder what sort of beings these "Anglo-Catholics" are, who make such pretentious claims for their church. Can they look each other in the face without laughing?

THE BIBLE AND ISLAM, or *The Influence of the Old and New Testaments on the Religion of Mohammed*, Being the Ely Lectures for 1897, by Henry Preserved Smith, D.D. Pages, 319. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1897.

Max Mueller has observed that what Goethe says of language is true also of religion, namely that he who knows but one, knows none. This does not mean, of course, that a person may not be religious without possessing a comparative knowledge of religions; but it means that no one can thoroughly understand the genius and value of his own religion, especially the Christian, without knowing something of the nature and character of others. Hence the comparative science of religion, as it is pursued in modern times, cannot but be of great value to the Christian theologian and minister. It will enlarge and liberalize his views; but it will also give him a higher appreciation of his own religion, and make him a more faithful pastor and a more devoted missionary.

But of the religions most worthy of the study of the Christian minister none is of more importance than the Mohammedan; and we know of no better and more convenient help to the study of this religion than the course of lectures embraced in this volume by Dr. Smith. The lectures are ten in number, treating respectively of the following subjects: The Apostle of Allah; the Common Basis in Heathenism; the Koran Narratives; the Doctrine of God; the Divine Government; Revelation and Prophecy; Sin and Salvation; the Service of God; the Future Life; the Church and State. In the first chapter we have a discussion of the character of Mohammed. This has always been an enigma to the historian of religion. As he is presented in history Mohammed was both a saint and a devil. He was undoubtedly a man of deeply religious nature, with whom piety towards God was a necessary element of life. He thoroughly believed in himself as prophet of Allah, and was sure that he was the recipient of Divine communications, or revelations. But he was also a liar, a lecher, and assassin. How can such qualities exist side by side in the same

personality? However impossible this may seem to us, the fact cannot be questioned. Dr. Smith shows, however, that such mixtures of good and evil are not uncommon in early stages of religious development, and that Mohammed was in fact no worse than some early Biblical characters, whose faults we are in the habit of overlooking. "The assassinations prompted by Mohammed," Dr. Smith observes, "should be judged as we judge the deeds of Ehud and Jael. His slaughter of the Jews stands by the side of Joshua's extermination of the Canaanites. His indulgence in wives was not more profane than David's, and fell far short of Solomon's luxury. Like David, he coveted his neighbor's wife, but he did not murder her husband, and he did not take possession of her until she had been divorced. He cursed his enemies, but so did the Psalmist; and the plea made for the Psalmist, that the object of his imprecations were the enemies of the cause of God, was precisely the plea that Mohammed would have made in all sincerity."

Mohammedanism, as Dr. Smith shows in these lectures, is not an original religion. It is not a pure development from the religious consciousness of a single people, like the religion of the Greeks, or the Brahmanism of the Hindoos. There are woven into it at least three elements, and these are derived from Arabic heathenism, from Judaism and from Christianity. The basis of it is Arabic heathenism, and this must be supposed to furnish the spirit and genius of the new religion. Mohammed and his followers did not cease to be Arabs when they ceased to worship the many gods who filled the air of the Arabian desert. What they did was simply to transfer the qualities from the many to the one whom they called Allah, and who, though somewhat touched with the sentiments attributed to God in Judaism, was still affected with Arab prejudices and passions. Mohammed's knowledge of Judaism and Christianity was quite superficial. He did not get his knowledge from the Bible. Indeed it is doubtful whether he could read at all. What information he had of Judaism and Christianity he picked up from the representatives of these religions in Arabia, and that was doubtless imperfect enough. The probability is that both Jews and Christians in Arabia were very far from *living* their religion, and so we need not be surprised to learn that what Mohammed absorbed from Judaism and from Christianity was not their ethical spirit, but merely a few of their legends. Nevertheless original Mohammedanism was better than that which now curses some of the fairest regions of the earth. Mohammedanism has shared the fate of all other merely human religions, by undergoing a process of degenerative development, and seems to be incapable of any reformation. It is destined to give way finally to Christianity, but this result can only be accomplished through an intellectual and ethical correspondence in which the original nature of Mohammedanism must be recognized. And to this end the work before us may be a valuable contribution.